DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

January, 1942

CAN WE HAVE THE FRUITS OF DEMOCRACY WITHOUT THE ROOTS? *Gordon Poteat* 3

BECAUSE WE ARE CHRISTIANS *Henry C. Newell* 14

NOTES ON M. C. OTTO'S DISCUSSION OF "CHRISTIAN ESSENTIALS" *Edgar Sheffield Brightman* 20

THE CHURCH TOMORROW *George E. Levy* 22

FURTHER COMMENTS ON CHRISTIAN ETHICS *Alban G. Widgery* 28

THE TONGUES OF MEN, OR OF ANGELS? *John Chilton Scammell* 36

MISSION FINANCE IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE *Frederick M. Derwacter* 47

SOME RECENT ENGLISH BOOKS IN CHURCH HISTORY *John T. McNeill* 51

FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON 60

BOOK REVIEWS 62

BOOK NOTICES 81

BOOKS RECEIVED 87

Volume XIX Number 1

330351

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, January, 1942, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Vol. XIX JANUARY, 1942 No. 1

CAN WE HAVE THE FRUITS OF DEMOCRACY WITHOUT THE ROOTS?

GORDON POTEAT
Crozer Theological Seminary

THE PEOPLE of the United States, with only minor exceptions, accept the validity of the three supreme principles of democracy, namely, the dignity and worth of the individual; freedom; and government by the consent of the governed. Though we find these principles derided and vilified in some quarters today, our observation of the tragic consequences of the denial of these fundamental rights of man deepens our faith in democracy and strengthens our determination to preserve and purify and extend these principles to the limit of our ability and responsibility.

Some years ago, Eugene Lyons, now editor of the *American Mercury,* was sent to Russia as correspondent of an American newspaper. He went with alacrity, for he had welcomed the Russian revolution with great enthusiasm as the portent of a new day of social and economic justice in the world. His actual experiences in Russia dampened his ardor, and upon his return to this country he wrote the record of his disillusionment in a book entitled *Assignment in Utopia.* Here are his concluding remarks:

> I left Russia convinced that man's greatest task is to defend the basic concepts of freedom and respect for life. . . . No plan for economic salvation can be accepted if it is diseased with disdain for life. Ultimately, the Russian experiment will be judged, not by the goal of a full belly, but by how much freedom, self-respect, justice, truth, and human kindness it has brought into the world.

My purpose in giving this quotation is to comment upon one of Mr. Lyon's phrases. It is to be noted that he asserts that he is "convinced that man's greatest task is to defend the basic concepts of freedom and respect for life." I raise the question whether the adjective "basic" is used advisedly of these two concepts. I do not think that it is. The concepts of freedom and respect for life are not basic, but derivative. These democratic ideals have an ulterior source. They are inferences from certain fundamental Christian convictions about life as a whole. I am convinced that apart from these Christian convictions the concepts of freedom and respect for life are rootless, and if they are separated from their roots they will wither away and die.

One of the dangerous blind spots in our American life today is right at this point. There are many of our people who seem to assume that we can preserve the fruits of democracy without the roots; that human dignity, freedom, and the right to self-government are self-sustaining, autonomous truths which need no undergirding religious faith for their perpetuation. In a recent lecture, Professor Theodore H. Greene, of the department of philosophy in Princeton University, challenged this complacent assumption as follows:

> A secular democratic society can maintain itself without explicit dependence on Christian faith as long as it can draw on its accumulated religious capital. But if it draws on this capital without replenishing it, the capital is finally exhausted. Today many people are trying to convince themselves that democracy is worth fighting for without regard to the religious basis of human dignity, and they are not finding it easy. What, from a purely secular point of view, can they find worth living for, or dying for? Democracy cannot indefinitely maintain its vitality without Christian roots.

Let us examine this matter more closely:

1. First let us consider the concept of the dignity of man. What dignity does man possess apart from God as the creator and sustainer of his worth? As the product of impersonal nature, how utterly insignificant and worthless he really is. A mechanical, soulless universe "cares nothing for his hopes or fears." Those who have no faith in God, the "great evaluer of persons," are often quite frank in their admission of the essential unimportance of man. "Astronomically speaking, man is almost totally negligible," says Harry Elmer Barnes. "As I see him, the unutterably infinitesimal individual weaves among the mysteries a floss-like and wholly meaningless course, if course it be," is the despairing confession of Theodore Dreiser. And Joseph Wood Krutch concludes his book, *The Modern Temper,* with the words: "Ours is a lost cause and there is no place for us in the natural universe."

Historically it has been Christianity which has asserted the dignity of man as man, regardless of class, race, or sex. Certainly there can be no disputing that Christianity was the source of this conception as far as we are concerned. Our civilization is rooted in Greece, as well as in Judea, but the conception of the infinite worth of the common man did not come from classical Greece, but from the Jewish-Christian religion. One need only live for a while, either where the Christian faith that man is a child of God and therefore of infinite worth has never been a part of the cultural tradition, or where Christian faith has been openly repudiated, to realize the cheapness of ordinary human life under non-Christian or antichristian social systems. I remember one of my Chinese colleagues on the faculty of the University of Shanghai telling in disgust

of an extended visit he made to the coal mining regions of Anhui where the miners were nicknamed *ro bing* ("meat cakes") because their labor was so utterly cheap and they were so often taken from the mines mutilated like hamburgers. Obviously, the life of miners is difficult enough in any part of the world, but it is never so desperately cheap as where the teaching of Christ has exercised no meliorating effect. John Dewey made such a discovery when he made an extended visit to the Orient. He remarked to my friend, Henry Leiper, then a missionary in Tientsin: "After living for an extended period in non-Christian lands, I have discovered that many reactions to specific situations which I had supposed you could expect of any normal individual, I now discover to be the reactions you can expect only of individuals who have been exposed to the long, steady influence of the Christian tradition." Eugene Lyons discovered how cheap life was in Soviet Russia where faith in God, the Father-Creator, is repudiated, though he may not have realized the connection between these two facts. A quotation from a Soviet journal makes it plain: "Communism does not recognize a metaphysical or spiritual value of human life." One has but to read *Out of the Night* by Jan Valtin if he needs further demonstration of this fact. Rauschning reports that Hitler in a conversation with him declared: "To the Christian doctrine of the supremacy of the individual conscience I oppose the emancipating doctrine that the individual is nothing and survives in the immortality of the nation." In sharp contrast Dr. Glover tells of how the Christian Synesius in 410 A.D. addressed the Roman governor, who had begun to oppress the people, in a tone he could not mistake. "The governor was treating human beings as if they were cheap, but 'man is a thing of price, for Christ died for him.' "[1]

It is odd to hear confessed secularists, who deny any ultimate ground of existence in an eternal God, speak, as they sometimes do, of the infinite worth of the individual. On their premise, where does infinity come in?

Dr. F. W. Foerster, in his remarkable history of the processes which have led to present-day Naziism, refers to Nietzsche's reproaching David Strauss "for accepting without criticism Christian *morality,* though he had destroyed Christian *theology,* whereas in fact the former is bound up with the latter and must share its fate."[2] He continues:

> The defenders of the rights of man and other so-called achievements of Liberalism are dismayed today by the momentum and speed with which all their claims are being trampled under foot by the Collective. . . . They do not perceive that it was Christianity that deprived Cæsar . . . of unrestricted power over the individual,

[1] T. R. Glover, *Jesus in the Experience of Men,* p. 221.
[2] *Europe and the German Question,* p. 444.

and by the martyr's blood secured the right of the individual conscience. The representatives of science are dismayed today by the ruthlessness with which the Collective is enslaving science to the State and making mock of its claim to serve truth. They do not perceive that the scientific conscience and its devotion to a truth sovereign above all wordly interests is purely religious in its origin and can be kept alive by religion alone.[3]

In this connection one other point needs to be noted. Men do maintain a sense of personal dignity apart from faith in God, but when a man asserts his worth without acknowledging that he, together with all other men, depends upon the All-Father for his existence, he tends to become arrogant, to affirm his worth by claiming a superiority to other men whom he may despise as inferior to himself. Thus we have the cult of the superman or the super race. Only the recognition that all of us depend ultimately on God for what we are can keep us from arrogance and pride. Without Christian faith man oscillates between arrogance and despair. So W. J. Oates in a recent article in the *American Scholar*: "Christianity absolutely insists that man be valued in proper perspective in relation to his fellows and to his God. Man must realize that his own individual value derives from God and has God ultimately for its sanction . . . it demands that man possess the virtue of humility."[4] The practice of democracy is impossible without this Christian virtue of humility, which, contrary to the common impression, is not abject groveling before those who are stronger than we, but recognition of the worth of all men as equal to ourselves in the sight of God. We cannot maintain that fundamental attitude toward our fellows which makes democratic association, deliberation, and government possible, apart from this Christian virtue of humility.

2. *The ideal of freedom.* Is freedom an unqualified principle of universal application? Can it stand upon its own feet? Is free speech an absolute and unconditioned right of man? Can we defend this principle apart from essential conditions of mutual responsibility and self-control which are the product of religious motivation? Is the man who does not acknowledge any obligation to God or to man fit for the exercise of freedom? Unqualified freedom is sheer license and irresponsibility. Unfortunately the idea that freedom is simply the unconditioned right to do anything one pleases is far too common among us. Democracy cannot be perpetuated on such a basis. It is in part, at least, disillusionment regarding the individualistic and anarchistic practice of this irresponsible conception of freedom which has resulted in authoritarian and totalitarian reactions against democracy, for, as Edmund Burke once put

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 446.

[4] "Democracy and Christianity" in the *American Scholar*, X (Summer, 1941), p. 333.

it, "society cannot exist without some restraint being placed upon individual appetites and passions, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be from without." Freedom is not a defensible ideal apart from its rootage in religion. "Liberty is impossible except on the basis of a general respect for law." The Psalmist understood this when he declared: "I will walk at liberty, for I seek thy precepts."[5] The Apostle Paul was a great protagonist of freedom, but he was clear as to its necessary condition: "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty as an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."[6] The Anglican *Prayer Book* asserts the same truth in another form: "In His service is perfect freedom"—and only in his service. We may well ponder William Penn's declaration: "If men will not be governed by God, they will be ruled by tyrants." In a recent book John Oman rightly stresses this point:

> Freedom is not secured by constitutions, but by those to whom it is dearer than life: and, so long as it has this value for us, by nothing can we be enslaved. When, however, we come to think of freedom as mere liberty to choose our own way of happiness, mainly material, there is always a point, much short of the price of life, where it becomes "too dear for our possessing." Only if there is a spiritual conviction that man's true worth is in his responsibility and the supreme value of freedom the right and power to exercise it, is no sacrifice for freedom too great.[7]

Here again, it may be worth pointing out how a concept such as freedom, which has been derived from a Christian principle, is perverted when it is cut off from its original source. How has the freedom of woman in our Western society been achieved? In the ancient world woman was often circumscribed, restricted, kept under stern taboo, secluded in purdah or harem, in order to protect her as the property of the family from trespass by predatory males. The prevailing attitude of man toward woman made such protection necessary. These restrictions could only be relaxed when a different attitude began to obtain: when woman was looked upon not primarily as a sex object, but as a person with a dignity and with rights belonging to one whose relation to God the Creator was identical with that of man. Christianity produced a new attitude on the part of man toward woman, and a new realization of her own worth on the part of woman. No doubt women have had to struggle for a recognition of their true status even in so-called Christian lands, but it has been in large part the dignity which Christianity has bestowed upon them which has inspired their struggle. But what happens when

[5] Psalm 119: 45.
[6] Gal. 5: 13.
[7] John Oman, *Honest Religion*, p. 179.

this hard-won freedom is severed from its religious basis, from that evaluation of the person which only Christianity supports? How easily man reverts to his unregenerate and animalistic attitude toward women, how quickly license takes the place of freedom, how readily the physical aspects of sex begin to dominate and personality becomes a diminishing factor in the relations of men and women. And when the spirit is subordinated to the flesh instead of the flesh to the spirit, freedom, which is essentially a spiritual achievement, disappears, and sensuality sets up its domineering rule. Are there not signs of such deterioration about us today? Professor R. H. S. Crossman suggests there are, when he writes:

> Long ago, in 1848, Karl Marx wrote a warning which his followers left unheeded. He said that if we merely abolish the restraints and restrictions of marriage we break down morality and level human life down to the standard of the beast. By giving men and women absolute freedom in their sexual life we let lust and greed run rampant, and women who were previously the private property of men become the public property of all who care to use them. Their position is worse than before: for now they are the common spoil of the whole community.[8]

3. As to the third principle of democracy, namely, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," it is necessary only to remark that the right to exercise a voice in the government of the people surely must depend upon the qualification that one has learned to govern oneself. This may not be politically enforceable as a requirement for the exercise of the ballot, but certainly if a very considerable number of the citizens lack this moral qualification, democracy will rot from within.

Few see more clearly than does Middleton Murry what "a delicate and precarious thing" democracy is and that genuine education and a high sense of civic responsibility are essential to its security. Thus he can insist:

> Democracy, unless it is incessantly revivified by the regeneration of its individual members, by Christian education, into the citizens of a Christian society, must degenerate into totalitarianism. The choice before democracy is simple: either the individual must learn to conquer his lower self and attain his true personality, as a citizen of a Christian society; or the democratic state, abandoned to be the instrument of the lower selves of its members, will enforce upon them a uniformity which is destructive of the whole personality.[9]

You cannot build a golden age out of leaden people, or, as Foerster prefers to phrase it: "Order must be created in the souls of individuals before it can take root in the state."[10] "Today we know that reason di-

[8] R. H. S. Crossman, *Plato Today*, p. 215.
[9] Middleton Murry, *The Price of Leadership*, pp. 186 f.; cf. p. 179.
[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 349.

vorced from religion is a solvent of all human society. Christianity alone produces the type of man with which states can be constructed and maintained. . . . The natural man is anti-social and abuses society for his personal ends. His spiritual nature must be renewed from above."[11] We are beginning to realize that scientific knowledge may be prostituted to the most terrible ends unless the men who make use of this knowledge are under the control of a conscience which is spiritually enlightened. Hitler has his scientists and intellectuals who serve his purpose, but Hitler declaims that "Conscience is a Jewish invention. Like circumcision it mutilates man." What are the bulwarks that will save our government from getting into the hands of such men some day? Is such an eventuality unthinkable? Can we be certain that "it can't happen here"? In his farewell address George Washington uttered a warning which needs reiteration today: "Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. . . . Reason and experience forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

This leads us to inquire what, after all, is the purpose of democracy? As we mobilize for the defense of democracy, it will be disastrous if the people fail to realize that democracy is a means, not an end in itself. There should be, as there is not now, a wide public discussion of the goal of democracy. Is material prosperity the "be all" and "end all" of our political organization? That alone? That first of all? If nothing higher guides our cravings, if no finer purpose informs our political institutions, perhaps democracy is not worth defending. If a tyrant can give the people "bread and circuses," why not acquiesce in tyranny if man lives by bread alone? There may be many who would rather "have bondage with ease than strenuous liberty." Plato, who did not know the Christian religion and was opposed to democracy—for him synonymous with mob rule—taught that "the true idealist . . . will see men as they are, observe their radical inequalities, and give to the many not self-government but security, not freedom but prosperity, not knowledge, but the 'noble lie.' "[12] It has been one of the strong contentions of the totalitarian states that they have overcome unemployment. Might not fascism do a better job for us in that respect than democracy? On the other hand, if soul growth, the spiritual development of the individual in community with his fellows is the *summum bonum,* then the form of government is of supreme importance, for only that type of government which provides conditions, not simply for material prosperity, but—far more important—for spiritual development, is adequate as a means to that end. Profes-

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 437.

[12] R. H. S. Crossman, *op. cit.,* p. 129.

sor Theodore Greene, to whom I have already referred, is well within the facts when he says:

> To say that people can be Christian only in a democracy is, of course, nonsense. Men have been sincere Christians under every form of tyranny. What can be asserted, however, is that political democracy is the only form of government yet devised which provides a safeguard against religious persecution and a guarantee of religious freedom. It is also clear that democracy is the only form of government which provides all its citizens with an opportunity to function as socially responsible individuals. It alone is fully compatible with that sense of the mature freedom and responsibility of the individual which Christianity is so concerned to emphasize.

We will not whole-heartedly support and defend democracy unless we espouse this high spiritual goal. The democracy which we now have is very far from perfect, and our only hope of progress toward a fuller and fairer exercise of the privileges of democracy by all our citizens lies in our being inspired to heroic struggle by acceptance of the true goal of living. Of course, democracy must provide for a fairer distribution of wealth, must be deeply concerned for the material welfare of its citizens, but a purely materialistic philosophy will not suffice to sustain even this social ideal. Increase in income may only swell the amounts which are wasted in gambling or other enervating and demoralizing practices. To quote Dr. Oman again: "We may have more riches but also more ways in which they take wings; more leisure but also more restless ways of tearing our nerves to tatters; more aids to being lively but also more occasions of being down-cast."[13] The words of the prophet Isaiah are still pertinent, for men may spend their money on that which is not bread and their labor on that which satisfieth not. Our contemporaries must be brought to realize the truth which President Wilson declared when he said: "The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. It can only be saved by becoming permeated by the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit."

What is our responsibility in these circumstances? If the analysis which I have given contains any considerable measure of truth, then that which must give us the deepest concern is the general ignorance on the part of multitudes of our people as to the vital relation between democracy and Christian faith. A statement issued not long ago in Britain applies with very little modification to ourselves:

> We are fighting in this war to maintain those elements in human civilization and in our national tradition which owe their origin to Christian faith. There is widespread and profound ignorance of that faith; there is, therefore, an urgent

[13] John Oman, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

need to strengthen our foundations by securing that effective Christian education which should be given . . . to the future citizens of this country.[14]

Who is responsible for this general ignorance as to the religious roots of our democracy? Walter Lippmann, in his Phi Beta Kappa address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered in December, 1940, at the University of Pennsylvania, laid the blame upon the educational leaders of our country. The address was published in the spring (1941) issue of the *American Scholar* under the caption, "Education vs. Western Civilization."[15] Mr. Lippmann claims "that during the past forty or fifty years those who are responsible for education have progressively removed from the curriculum of studies the Western culture which produced the modern democratic state; that the schools and colleges have, therefore, been sending out into the world men who no longer understand the creative principle of the society in which they must live." Mr. Lippmann's analysis of the causes of the sickness of our society supports our contention both as to the real roots of democracy and contemporary ignorance thereof. I quote:

> Yet the historic fact is that the institutions we cherish—and now know we must defend against the most determined and efficient attack ever organized against them—are the products of a culture which, as Gilson put it, "is essentially the culture of Greece, inherited from the Greeks by the Romans, transfused by the Fathers of the Church with the religious teachings of Christianity. . . ."
>
> The men who wrote the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights were educated in schools and colleges in which the classic works of this culture were the substance of the curriculum. . . .
>
> Modern education, however, is based on a denial that it is necessary or useful or desirable for the schools and colleges to continue to transmit from generation to generation the religious and classical culture of the Western world. . . . Modern education rejects and excludes from the curriculum of necessary studies the whole religious tradition of the West. . . .
>
> There is no common faith, no common body of principle, . . . no common moral and intellectual discipline. Yet the graduates of these modern schools are expected to form a civilized community. They are expected to govern themselves. They are expected to have a social conscience. . . . When one realizes that they have no common culture is it astounding that they have no common purpose? That they worship false gods? . . . That in the fierce struggle for existence they are tearing Western society to pieces? . . .
>
> By separating education from the classical religious tradition the school cannot train the pupil to look upon himself as an inviolable person because he is made in the image of God. These very words, though they are the noblest words in our language, now sound archaic. The school cannot look upon society as a brotherhood arising out of a conviction that men are made in a common image.

[14] I am indebted for this quotation from a Lambeth pronouncement to the lecture by Professor Greene, of Princeton, to which I have referred above.

[15] *American Scholar*, X, 2 (1941), pp. 184-193. The following quotations from pp. 184 and 187-189 are reprinted by permission of author and publisher.

The teacher has no subject matter that even pretends to deal with the elementary and universal issues of human destiny.

Mr. Lippmann is not the only leader who has shown grave concern because of the religious illiteracy of many of our citizens. He lays most of the blame upon the educational leaders of the nation who have cut the schools off from their cultural roots. But in a nation in which church and state are separated by law, only persuasion may be exercised to induce our educators to concern themselves with the matters of which we have been speaking. Thus it behooves those of us whose vocation lies within organized religion to ask ourselves how far the churches and their ministers are responsible for failure to convince the educators of the vital relation between Christian faith and social and political health. How much influence are the churches bringing to bear upon the intellectual and social trends of our national life? Have the churches generally accepted as an important part of their responsibility the interpretation, purification, and perpetuation of democratic institutions and practices as they derive from Christian principles and make possible social progress? The criticism that many churches are intellectually timid, socially reactionary, and religiously sedentary cannot easily be denied. We smile at mediæval theologians debating how many angels can stand upon the point of a needle, but there are contemporary theological disputes which are hardly less irrelevant. Indeed, Christianity in some of its contemporary ecclesiastical manifestations is definitely antagonistic to democracy. Not Roman Catholics alone, but some Protestant groups as well, stand against freedom of thought, against the right of the individual to investigate truth for himself or to accept only that which commends itself to his conscience and reason. Some have essayed to establish strict limits within which the minds of men may move, thereby denying that principle of responsible choice which God risked in men's hands when he purposed to produce sons and not slaves.

It has been widely observed that the repudiation of Christianity in Russia and in Germany has been the result, in part at least, of the slavish subordination of the churches to the status quo and the absence of social concern in their teaching and preaching. Theological scholarship in pre-Hitler Germany enjoyed a high degree of freedom in research, which was all to the good, but scholarship was isolated from the life of the common people, and scholars lived in ivory towers far from the madding crowds. In Russia the priests were the servants of the state rather than of the people, purveyors of superstition rather than of enlightenment. Because we are a new nation, making a fresh start on the road of destiny, we in America have been more favorably situated religiously than the old countries. But if we are to avoid the pit into which some of them

have fallen, if we are to lead into a better day and not become victims of an evil future, our churches need to read correctly these lessons of the recent past. The education of the future leadership of the churches is of supreme importance at this point. As go the ministers, so go the churches; blind leaders of the blind still fall with their followers into the ditch. The preservation, purification, and extension of democracy depends in great measure upon those who understand the connection between the roots of democracy and its fruits. These most naturally are, or should be, the ministers of the churches of the land, whose prime function is the proclamation of Christian truth and the exhibition of its relevancy to all of the experiences and relationships of life. Thus it is most important that these ministers be trained in schools where the highest devotion to freedom in the exploration of the truth is combined with the keenest recognition of social responsibility, where men are taught to love God with mind as well as heart, and their neighbors as themselves. I associate freedom with responsibility, for intellectual freedom divorced from social responsibility leads to anarchy, while responsibility without freedom is slavery. It is among schools of this character—free and responsible—that Crozer Theological Seminary aspires to bear its part. It would fain give itself to the cultivation of those Christian roots which, under God, produce the fine fruits of democracy: the dignity, the freedom, and the self-government of man.

BECAUSE WE ARE CHRISTIANS

HENRY C. NEWELL

First Congregational Church, Harwich, Massachusetts

Up in northwestern Vermont on the eastern shore of Lake Champlain where the distant Green Mountain range forms a majestic border to the Champlain Valley and, across the lake, the Adirondacks give rugged background for glorious sunsets, is situated a summer camp for girls where discriminating parents encourage their growing daughters to locate for the vacation months. Here, under rather rare guidance, these fortunate young women build health and character by combining with equestrian and aquatic skill, the intensive study of the French language. Here, also, the writer has the happy privilege of meeting them one Sunday evening each year to join in their vesper worship, and to counsel with them concerning the problems and opportunities of this confused and confusing time. In the correspondence incident to a convenient appointment, the director of the camp wrote:

> The more I see of our modern girls the more I think certain things need saying, and the Sunday service is perhaps the most appropriate time to say them. . . . Our camp motto is *Noblesse oblige,* for which I have never found an adequate translation; but I wish our girls could be made to realize that every privilege implies a responsibility.

Here was a challenge to any preacher! *Noblesse oblige*—what a theme! As for finding an adequate translation for the words, what could be easier? But when the actual search for that translation began, my linguistic assurance received a severe jolt. *"Noblesse oblige,"* I read, "French. Literally, nobility obliges." And then, quite aware of the unhappy ambiguousness of such rendering, the dictionary itself found an explanation in order: "Noble birth or rank compels to noble acts, hence the obligation to noble conduct imposed by nobility." Now in America we have no social rank which determines "nobility," but we do have men and women and young people whose economic and social circumstances impose upon them the duty of being strong and helpful. To such a group the young women of the camp belong: here was the vesper sermon.

The fact is, however, as we all well know, the problem suggested by the camp director is by no means confined to a single group of young women in a summer camp. It is a universal American problem and it knows no limitation of age or sex. As a people, we Americans are curiously unappreciative of the privileges of our citizenship, and even

more unaware that such privileges imply responsibilities. Because we are Americans we ought——.

Nor is it a problem confined to any nationality. There is a compelling logic about this line of thought which raises a further question in the mind of every thoughtful Christian. If American citizenship implies obligations, then certainly membership in the body of Christian believers must have its obligations, too. You just can't dodge it, kind Christian reader, because we are Christians we ought——what? But here we come upon one of the tragedies of present-day Christianity. There are so many ways of completing that sentence, so many answers to the question as to what really are the obligations of being a Christian that we are in danger of giving undue emphasis to non-essentials. Of course, as true followers of Jesus we shall probably all agree that we are under obligation to love God with the whole personality, and with the widest interpretation of the word "neighbor" to love our neighbors as ourselves. But beyond all this there are certain sacred obligations that rest upon us because we are Christians. They are the Christian's *noblesse oblige.*

I

A group of us were sitting about an open fire one cool, summer evening not long since. Outside the wind was blowing a gale, and occasionally during a lull in the storm the sound of pounding surf could be heard above the wind. It was just the night for a good talk around the open fire. Some of the group had been reading Jan Valtin's terrifically fascinating *Out of the Night.* The discussion of the book brought up the question of loyalties, and the dominie suggested that the Christian church ought to be able to inspire in young people as great loyalty as the communist party gets from the youth who devote themselves to its cause.

"Why can't the church," he asked, "demand and get from young men and women just as great—indeed, greater—loyalty to its ideals? What better goal can be imagined than a really Christian world, and what more inspiring task than the remaking of this pagan civilization into a truly Christian society that will bear at least a decent semblance to that ideal which we call the kingdom of God?"

"But," objected Emeritus, "that is not the business of the church. The real business of the church is with men's souls. It is a spiritual, not an economic or social, challenge which confronts the church. It is quite enough to prepare men for heaven, and if that task is well performed the church will find its time well filled without mixing in economics or politics."

It was a bit of a surprise to hear Emeritus talking like this. He is

not narrow, and he has seen the world. Only just a few minutes earlier he was talking most delightfully of his experience as a Y. M. C. A. man in the first world war, and telling us of a most interesting interview with the military governor of a Russian city. It may be that the passing years have brought that weariness of spirit which is dubious of success in human reformation midst mundane conditions. Be that as it may, his mild conservatism drew quick response.

"Well, what is the church for, anyway? What is Christianity for? In fact, just what is Christianity?" The young metallurgist who sat back in the shadow took his pipe from his lips and entered the conversation. "You gentlemen have been saying that the church should do this and the church should do that, but you don't seem quite to agree as to what is the function of the church in this perplexing situation, and I am wondering if in the final analysis you would agree on a definition of Christianity. You know, it is this difference of opinion as to what Christianity really is that makes us young people doubtful about the church. You theologians, teachers, and preachers seem to us like Paul's accusers in Ephesus, some saying one thing, some another, a confused multitude, mostly quite unaware of the real issues. If you could all agree on one or two fundamental things and then let people believe what they choose about what seem to me to be non-essentials—but I suppose my non-essentials would be some other man's essentials. Just the same, why can't somebody work out a plan which will enable all branches of the Christian church—it ought also to include the Jews—to unite in the two essentials of love to God and love to man, and then let us add, individually and without prejudice, such further articles of belief as seem personally needful?"

This was a long speech for the engineer. Usually he is far from loquacious, but evidently he had been stirred. As the rest of us sat meditating on his query and answering not a word, he took up the thread of argument again: "Dominie," he turned directly toward me, "you wonder why the church does not command a loyalty like that of the communist party. I believe I can tell you. It is because the church does not offer a sufficiently challenging goal. Emeritus, here, would have it prepare us for heaven. Most young folks are not much interested in heaven. To begin with, it looks a long way off, and also we are a bit skeptical about what may happen after death, but we are tremendously interested in what is going to happen here and now. If the church would devote itself to the building of a warless world, a just and honest world, it would immediately be commanding a strong following of America's best youth. If the church would be content to unite on the essential and be tolerant of the non-essential, it would be well on the way toward

enthusiastic support from young people who would eagerly flock to its standard. If it really should do this, it would put the communist party out of business, for it would be engaged in achieving much of the communists' desirable aims without the element of force which seems necessary to communism, and by means of the very influences which to the communist seem futile."

As we drove home that evening I pondered the young scientist's remarks. Is he right? Unity, tolerance. Because we are Christians we ought to be united in our aims and tolerant in our beliefs. Well, why not? Certainly we as Christians believe in the universal fatherhood of God. On that basis may we not rightly hold to the universal brotherhood of man? Upon such a foundation may we not build an enduring structure of unity and tolerance? United as children of one divine Father, and tolerant as brothers and sisters in a world-wide family.

It is not too difficult to visualize a very general acceptance of the idea of the universal fatherhood of God. It is much more difficult to see present-day Christians united in the working out of universal human brotherhood. The racial, economic, and social problems involved are not easy of solution, and they demand the best of wisdom, patience, and goodwill. Here surely is a field for tolerance, and tolerance wisely exercised in this field may prove a key of the kingdom!

II

It was at the breakfast table next morning. The dominie had hardly raised his head from morning grace when the lady of the house interrupted the sugaring of her cantaloupe with a question: "Do you remember what that young man said last night? About a just and honest world? You know, I happened to be looking right at him when he said that, and there was something awfully sincere and rather wistful in his face." And then with one of those sudden flashes of combined common sense and spiritual insight which makes her the dominie's keenest and most understanding critic, she opened up on him with this disconcerting attack: "You know, I wonder about you old fellows sometimes with all your talk about love to God and love to man, and how those are the foundation stones of Christianity! What about honesty, just good, ordinary, old-fashioned honesty? Isn't that pretty important, too?"

For a question like that from such a source there is, of course, only one reply—dignified retirement behind the morning paper.

Important? Honesty, important? The dominie knows right well it is more than "pretty important." It is unqualifiedly essential to Christianity. In the final analysis it is absolutely fundamental to decent living. And,

unhappily, every keen observer of modern civilization is well aware that ever since the beginning of the first world war when a German Kaiser regarded an international treaty as a scrap of paper there has been a steady and all too universal decline in honesty, both personal and national. It is evidence of a disease of character which if permitted to grow and spread will, in the not far distant future, utterly destroy civilization. With it have come a host of germs of suspicion and disillusionment which have already infected and seriously weakened our body politic.

Quite recently a high school principal, rated high as teacher and disciplinarian, a man who has succeeded in inspiring his students to something of idealism both in the classroom and on the athletic field, expressed himself as regretting the tendency to take selfishness and greed for granted. He added that his pupils were inclined to look upon all public officials—local, state, and national—as open to suspicion. Thus, lack of honesty in public life causes our younger citizens to lose faith in those standards of truth, honesty, and fair play which are necessary to the maintenance of democratic ideals. Disillusionment following upon the heels of dishonesty breeds suspicion in the hearts of American youth and ultimately leads them to question the value of democracy and indeed the validity of the Christian ideal. To such an extent is this true that the student paper of a well-known New England college recently published an editorial containing these significant sentences:

> Corruption in high places does not disturb us, but honesty astonishes us when it appears. Nothing wells up in our throat when "God Save the King" is played, and we do not find it easy to associate Winston Churchill with King Arthur. Nobility in anything is suspect among us. This is not an intellectual skepticism, but an attitude with which we have become infused.
>
> We are going into this war with no strong feeling that there are any ideals involved; we see no visions of Christian knighthood in the clouds. . . . This war to us has neither an idealist right nor an idealist wrong, it is simply more confusion. . . . We are a flock of moral amœbas, a race of young animals to whom pessimism has become a natural and constant condition of mind.

What is needed is the clear, pure air of common honesty to cleanse our American political atmosphere of this infectious miasma of pessimism and despair. The practical application of this remedy depends upon the influence and activity of the Christian citizen. Pulpit and pew alike may well give to this problem their best thought and their most earnest endeavor. Moreover, it is not an impossible task. The truth is that when the men and women who profess Christianity in America sincerely unite to eliminate dishonesty from modern life, dishonesty will be eliminated. Because we are Christians we must be honest.

III

Writing in the current *Atlantic*,[1] Mr. Harry Scherman tells us that "it is impossible . . . to acquire an unshakable philosophy about the war until one great simple truth about modern society is understood: that all the diverse peoples on this planet are now bound together, inseparably, in an economic world union." He adds that "the evolution to this state began in the earliest days of recorded human history and has proceeded inexorably in spite of many retardations." Now whether Mr. Scherman's "great simple truth about modern society" is essential to a satisfactory philosophy of war or not, it certainly is absolutely essential to a philosophy of permanent peace. Mr. Scherman sees this clearly and writes to urge a general political unification which shall be reasonably comparable to the economic interdependence which scientific progress has forced upon the world. Is it not pertinent to inquire if that necessity for political unification does not offer rare opportunity for the Christian church to make substantial progress toward the establishment of that ideal democracy which Christians like to think of as the kingdom of God?

It is desirable to remind ourselves that this political unification is the union of governments, and that governments represent considerable groups of men—and that every man has a soul! Because of this last fact—the spiritual content in every human personality—there must be a spiritual foundation underlying all these practical considerations of economics. If we are to achieve permanent united world peace, that peace must rest upon spiritual foundations. Essential Christianity affords such foundations in its basic doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God.

Any satisfactory development of this thesis would carry us far beyond the limitations of this article. Immediately we recognize the demands which such unification would make upon tolerance and honesty. Above all, it will call for unselfishness, personal, institutional, national. But unselfishness is of the very essence of Christianity in both individual and institution. When we contemplate the sacrifices in terms of limitations of sovereignty and in the elimination of personal greed, it seems almost impossible. When, however, we reflect upon the ultimate result of continuing our present course of selfish aggrandizement, we recognize the imperative necessity of drastic reform.

Noblesse oblige. Because we are Christians let us be tolerant, honest, unselfish.

[1] "The Last Best Hope of Earth," *Atlantic Monthly* (Nov., 1941), pp. 567-574. The words quoted are from p. 567.

NOTES ON M. C. OTTO'S DISCUSSION OF "CHRISTIAN ESSENTIALS"

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University

A CRITICISM from Mr. Max C. Otto is reward enough for any writer. His discussion of my "Essentials of Christianity," in the CROZER QUARTERLY (October, 1941) is stimulating and acute. If my comments are blunt, it is not for lack of appreciation. I want the problems brought out sharply in brief space.

1. Mr. Otto says that my classifying him as a Christian "is to court the kind of intellectual and moral confusion which is by all means to be avoided." I should reply that I do not court the confusion. I simply point to it. To call my friend a Christian courts no more confusion than does his own practice in *The Human Enterprise* of calling his view ethical theism and cosmic atheism.

2. Mr. Otto seems to overlook my intent, which was stated in the first sentence as "to know what Christianity is." This does not imply a desire to define what Christianity ought to be, much less to define religion. It implies only a purely historical question, which I answer by saying that one is a Christian if "he finds somewhere in the Christian Scriptures, especially in the records about Jesus, a source of supreme moral and religious inspiration." I had supposed that Mr. Otto had found, and would acknowledge having found, such inspiration in the records about Jesus. If I am right, he is a Christian despite his protestations; he is a part of the "growing oak." If I am wrong, I retract and apologize.

3. Mr. Otto finds my criterion, just quoted, "a nest of ambiguities." It is a cave of Adullam, I admit, but I do not know how to define Christianity without allowing that Christians are a motley crew. I should like to improve the definition; but Mr. Otto's hint to change from "somewhere in the Christian Scriptures" to "*anything* found *anywhere*" therein would worsen matters badly, in two ways. First: one could then be a Christian on the basis of a single verse, a single word; this religion of the jot and tittle would furnish no moral or religious inspiration worth mentioning. Second: my basic definition of a Christian as "anyone who seeks to follow Jesus" would then be rejected; Jesus is a person, and a person is more than any one word or verse or incident.

4. My "search for synthesis" to which Mr. Otto objects is simply

the method for discovering the essence—and (although this was not the purpose of the article) also for criticizing and interpreting it.

5. In his specific criticism of my concrete "essentials," Mr. Otto, I fear, raises dust without clearing the air. (1) On my first essential, he inquires how we can follow Jesus without knowing him; but my reference to the Scriptures was meant to make clear that the portrait of Jesus in the gospel record furnishes the criterion, not some almost unknowable historical absolute, dimly accessible only to the historical critic. The Jesus I am talking about means the person portrayed in the gospels. (2) As to my second point, all I can say is that I quite agree with everything Mr. Otto says about it, except his idea that my words require a Christian to be theistic. They were carefully phrased to avoid that interpretation. I do indeed believe that a sound thinker will be a theist; but I am not convinced that all Christians are sound thinkers. (3) In questioning whether all Christians are humble, Mr. Otto confuses belief and practice. Do not all Christians believe they should be humble? (4) Mr. Otto objects that my view requires redemption to be taken "with considerable latitude." Well, I agree. Any definition of Christianity that is not arbitrary and intolerant must be latitudinarian. Mr. Otto's "dig" that I walk around the problem of evil is irrelevant to my aim and, I venture to say, hardly fair to my work on that problem. (5) I had supposed that an ethical theist could translate a reference to God into his own language; but Mr. Otto insists that every mention of God in the article must mean a personal God. Such was not my intent. In fact, personalists have berated me for omitting "the Fatherhood of God" as an essential. But Mr. Otto did not notice that omission or its implications.

6. In his final section Mr. Otto laments that the article gives no message to youth. I freely grant that my aim was not homiletic, didactic, nor ethical. It was purely historical and semantic; and I believe that even youth needs and appreciates definitions before moving on to values and philosophies of life.

THE CHURCH TOMORROW

GEORGE E. LEVY

United Baptist Church, Hartland, New Brunswick

ANY REFERENCE to the church of tomorrow at once raises the prior question, "What sort of world may be expected tomorrow?"

No one is seer enough to give a complete answer to that question. Yet, if the study of the past has taught us anything, there are some things that may be safely asserted about the world of tomorrow. It will not be an ordered and steady world. Confusion and bewilderment will prevail on every hand. Depleted energies and resources will produce widespread disillusionment. Nations betrayed by traitors and battered by gunfire will lie in ruins. Emotions released after the long suspense of war years will find expression in the usual unhealthy forms.

There are some persistent questions today which suggest other possible lines in this picture. Will our liberties remain? Into what jeopardy will our sacred rights have fallen? How greatly will our social and political institutions be altered? Will there be a church tomorrow? "Who knows," some are anxiously asking, "but that this institution which has withstood the shocks of centuries will itself go down to ruin in these dark days?" It is this last question which gives force to an earnest consideration of the place the church will be called upon to assume in the world tomorrow.

This may sound like a gloomy forecast of "the shape of things to come." Yet, if it be only in the least measure correct, it can be said at once that the church tomorrow must be great enough to match the needs of the bewildered world which will follow the present holocaust of death and destruction. It must be great enough to meet effectively the terrible forces which are now being created and unleashed in our world. It must be shorn of its pride, its pettiness and its narrowness, and be dominated by a loftier spirit than that which has so often possessed it in the days of its endless divisions and its enfeebling schisms.

I

On every hand today the criticism is being raised that the church has failed. That criticism may or may not be true. It is true, however, that whether or not the church of tomorrow matches the needs of the hour may depend on just how honestly and penitently it faces its situation in the present-day world. Self-examination can be as profitable for the church as for the individual church member. William James, when

finishing his great work, *The Principles of Psychology,* wrote to his brother, Henry, "I have to forge every sentence in the teeth of stubborn and irreducible facts." Those who make up the church of Jesus Christ ought to be as honest as the great psychologist. The church has certain "stubborn and irreducible facts" to face about itself in the present order of things.

The position of the church today can scarcely be called enviable. It has been outlawed by communism; is well-nigh prostrate before the dominance of the totalitarian states, and is scorned and rejected by large numbers in the democracies. The appeal of the new political ideologies has supplanted it in the first loyalty of millions. It must be acknowledged, of course, that during the last century and a half of modern history the church has been directly confronted with varying forms of strange political conceptions. For instance, the antithesis between nationalism and loyalty to the church was sharply defined as long ago as the French Revolution. Not until the present, however, have these political conceptions called so fiercely and aggressively for man's absolute obedience, challenging the supremacy of every other loyalty, including that to God and his will. As a consequence, never before in her history has there been so widespread a refusal to recognize the church's authority.

The most exhaustive survey of the situation is not enough. The matter of prime importance is that of facing the facts of the situation. The facts surely challenge the church to look deep in an effort to determine whether they do indicate in any way a failure on her part. Some very searching questions will arise from this heart-searching: Had the church manifested a different spirit or pursued a different policy, could the swelling tides of neopaganism have been stayed? Would her authority count for more today? Could she command a greater respect on the part of "the world" had her spirit been more like that of her Lord? These questions and many other closely related ones are of fundamental importance when the place of the church tomorrow is considered, and may be ignored only at the peril of her very existence.

It would require volumes to give an adequate account of all the forces and factors which underlie and help to account for the present situation. Some of the conclusions, however, can be very briefly stated. While the most biased critic would scarcely charge the church with an entire lack of genuineness in her life in the decades just gone, it is unfortunately true that her life has oftimes been far from ideal. There has been an alarming degree of self-centredness, a divorce of doctrine from the realities of the life of those to whom she ministered, often a fatal hesitancy to give direction in the midst of confused thinking, a

spiritual pride which made her content to cry, "The temple of the Lord is with us," and to overlook the weightier matter of "doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God." The reactionary stand of the church more than once hindered the progress of moral and social reform. Each of these charges suggests its own ugly chapter in her history during the last century, without going farther back. The presence of these "stubborn and irreducible facts" forces on the church the necessity of deep heart-searching and repentance. This exercise may well mark the beginning of a day of more intelligent and rightly motivated Christian service.

A final question remains. Has too much been expected of the church? Much of the criticism directed against her fails to recognize that the very conception of the church involves a paradox, the implications of which are painfully evident in her life and witness. The church is in many respects an institution resembling other institutions of a very human sort. It has also a divine and otherworldly aspect. While it reveals at times all the painful limitations of sinful humanity, it "remains the fellowship to which our Lord has given his promise, and through which he carries forward his purpose for mankind," as the International Missionary Council meeting at Madras affirmed. Her ideal nature is not fully realized in the ecclesiastical institutions which give her concrete and visible form, and her glorious character is often sadly marred by the human medium through which it is expressed. Real as is the paradox, violence is done the unique character of the Christian church if there is a failure to place the emphasis on the ideal. When the church is seen against the background of this ideal nature, how far is criticism justified? Before the church faces tomorrow it must answer this question, courageously and honestly.

II

If the currents of thought and action within the church repeat their movements as they have in the past, it is safe to look forward to a program of action with a renewed emphasis on what has been termed the "social gospel." Twenty-five years ago an intensive effort was put forward to give a fuller application to the teachings of the gospel to social and economic problems. A good beginning had been made under the leadership of Walter Rauschenbusch. The emphasis in this direction ebbed greatly during the years 1914-1919, to increase again slowly from the early 20's onward. The post-war world gave a new focus to the old problems, and the demand for their solution in the light of the ethical teachings of the greatest of Israel's prophets and of the New Testament became even more insistent than it had been. War, or na-

tional disaster of a cataclysmic nature, always serves to accentuate the apocalyptic aspects of biblical teaching. However, when the smoke of battle clears and the confusion slows its pace, the hopes of men turn again to the more immediate task of building a better world.

This renewed emphasis on the application of the social and ethical teachings of the Bible will be all to the good, and quite what is to be expected of the church, if it is to become the vanguard in the work of moral rehabilitation and social reconstruction. This neglect in the past is the explanation in part unquestionably of the subservient position of the church in certain dictator states. If the church fails to emphasize this application of the great social and ethical teachings of the prophets and of the New Testament to every realm of life, it is coming short of what is more and more recognized as its solemn and legitimate duty. Even a conference containing so many conservative minds and varying attitudes as that which met at Tambaram in 1938, could unanimously agree that, "while the church has no universally valid political and economic program, through its very existence within the State and Society it should serve to emphasize Christian principles in social life."

The matter cannot be left at that. A much-needed caution ought to be added to this expectation. The emphasis on the so-called "social gospel" is liable to become one-sided, and like any such emphasis will carry the seeds of its own destruction right within itself. This emphasis must not be made indifferent to the great religious foundations of such a gospel. Unless this caution be heeded, there may result only what has been picturesquely described as "the suds of an ethical liberalism." At the base of this failure is the cleavage which all too easily comes in liberal Christianity between the religious and the ethical. The social gospel is definitely more than an ethic. It has a deeply rooted religious motivation. It may even be said that the utterances of the church tomorrow on the vital problems of society, economics, and politics, must have a solid doctrinal foundation. I do not mean "doctrinal foundation" to be taken as synonymous with outmoded theories or reactionary diatribes, all of which conceal rather than reveal the heart of the great facts of the Christian faith which they seek to interpret. A good deal of light is thrown on this matter by a sentence from one of the greatest of contemporary philosophers, Dr. A. N. Whitehead. He is referring to times of ferment and reconstruction when he writes, "Such ages, if they are to avoid ignorant oscillation between extremes, must seek truth in its ultimate depths." The quest for truth in the past has not always led to its ultimate depths—and this observation holds for many who never espoused the social gospel. Tomorrow in her search for truth the church must seek it in the ultimate depths of the doctrine of the sovereign God,

in the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, in the great doctrine of the incarnation and in the equally important doctrine of the atonement. There must be a new and more intensive searching of the doctrine of man. These doctrines of the Christian faith invite men to explore them afresh, that their truths may find wide and pointed application. Here the world of tomorrow may safely look for light to lead it from its confusion. A message and a program of action based solidly on these aspects of Christian doctrine will assure a finer ethical approach to the problems of human relationships, and a release of spiritual energies which will provide warmth of passion and sustaining power.

III

The spirit and the message of the church tomorrow are as important as its program of action. Its task will be to surcharge the world with spiritual vision and moral power. There will be committed to it, as to no other institution, the task of lifting the eyes of men above the wreckage surrounding them to the far-off horizons of God's eternal truth. Not only must it aid men to pursue the vision steadfastly but also to discover the power which enables them to transform the vision into a reality in their broken world. The spirit of the church must be such as helps to introduce the heavenly and the eternal into the earthly and the temporal in so far as aspects of reality so different can be brought together. Its spirit will be an altar fire whereat are kindled the courage, the faith, the hope, and the pure and keen desire needed to build the New Jerusalem. Its message will be as of old, "one that brings good tidings," lifting up its voice without fear, proclaiming along the highways of the world, "Behold your God reigneth." Only a church suffused with this spirit and in possession of this message can lift the burdens of hopelessness from the hearts of men and bring clearness and confidence for the confusion which now prevails.

Tomorrow man will be as sadly in need as ever of this ministry. One of the strangest paradoxes of the modern world is that which discloses the place, or fate, of man in the present order of things. In that day just gone when progress went on apace and humanisms were the vogue, man held the centre of the stage. In everything he attempted to exalt himself. He was flattered with a sense of his own greatness. He had brought all things in the physical world about him under his control, and the marvelousness of his instruments of benefaction was only surpassed by the satanic character of his weapons of destruction. There was much talk about "the perfectibility of man." Within him, so it was said, were carried all the elements necessary for his moral and spiritual perfection. These elements needed merely to be released by the magic

key of modern progress, and he would develop into the perfect man. Indeed, in some quarters, it was loudly proclaimed that God could no longer be regarded in a theistic sense, but only as the sum total of human values, or the projection of the fondest and deepest hopes of men, a sort of symbol of the virtues resident within man himself. The result of all this has been most pathetic. Not only did man lose sight of God, but he himself became lost, hidden beneath the destructiveness of the world he had made and its confusion. He had exalted himself to the stars, but the deluge which swept the earth from 1914 onward brought him down and made him a prisoner. The meaning of the paradox seems clear: Place all the emphasis on man, and you debase him.

Now man needs above all things to be led back from this dark fate to the God who dwells on high. In this is his only hope. There will he see himself as he is and find release from his bondage. Only a penitent and chastened church can lead him back there. Tomorrow the church must bear witness to the sovereign and righteous character of the God who lives and reigns and before whom man is a servant, finding his truest glory only as he acknowledges the greatness and the glory of God. To the men of tomorrow, the church, putting aside all humanisms and judging modern progress for what it is worth in terms of the highest values of life, must cry anew, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint."

The emphasis on the righteousness and the glory of God provided the dominant theme for the works of the greatest theologians of the church—Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and John Calvin. Their writings helped to prepare the way for the shaping of those forces which have won the greatest measure of freedom for the human spirit and the fullest recognition of the sacredness of personality. The church tomorrow will do well to recapture and proclaim anew the distinctly biblical emphasis that man can only find his truest self as he humbles himself before a God whose glory fills the heavens and the earth. This will produce character great enough to live worthily and to serve sacrificially.

Will the church tomorrow respond to its high calling? It is imperative that it do so, for it may be the only light in the world that is left to us—and if that light be darkness, then how terrible indeed shall be our darkness!

FURTHER COMMENTS ON CHRISTIAN ETHICS

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

Duke University

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, it was not uncommon for an author to consider in the form of an article criticisms of a book he had published. That practice might well be revived. When he invited me to contribute a paper to this Quarterly, the editor consented that I might discuss some significant comments on my latest book, *Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life.* Dealing as I shall be with what appear adverse criticisms, I take the risk of suggesting that it is a bad book, but I could not use this opportunity as one to quote laudatory reviews. While Dr. Gordon Poteat in this Quarterly (Jan., 1941) writes that it is not an "original discussion of Christian ethics," Dr. Charles S. Macfarland in his *Current Religious Thought* says that it makes "a real contribution to a much studied subject." It seems to me that both are right. What sort of discussion of Christian ethics would be original? Must it include ideas that no one before has expressed? If, as I maintain, Christian ethics evolve, the development may be expected to include the emergence of some new ideas. Certainly, in this volume I make no such contribution. I am convinced that the time has not arrived for such new ideas as I would like to suggest in this field. In opposition to frequent one-sided presentations, my purpose was to give, as recognized by most reviewers, a "well-balanced," "comprehensive," "thorough-going" "interpretation of Christian morality, both in its basic principles and in practical application to concrete issues." During thirty-five years' study of the subject, I became convinced that was a task which needed to be done.

Talking of the book, a member of the faculty of a theological seminary amazed and confounded me by saying: "Why can't you be a Christian?" In spite of the conversation that followed, I am still in doubt as to what he meant. Perhaps he had a feeling that there was something lacking because I had not written with the religious fervor of the preacher. Dr. Aubrey is correct in remarking: "the book has not the prophetic fervor to inspire any crusader." My impression is that pastors in the United States of America are fed too much on books of emotional piety calling for little study. Or the implication of his comment may be that I had not written of the ethics of the "true Christian," the "redeemed" in the sense involved in an elaborate paper by an eminent theologian concerning the question of "the continuance of sin in the life of the redeemed." I am incapable of understanding such a conception of the "redeemed," which seems to me to savor simply of the magical.

There is a possibility that he had in mind that I had ignored certain traditional Christian doctrines. Some others refer to my "theological bias." I do not deny the charge, which is too frequently made against any views differing from those of the critic. But when I am told that this theological bias prevents me "from presenting Christian ethics in its full and true aspect in the light of the teachings of the Word of God," all I can do is to ask for light as to this "full and true aspect." My treatment implies a distinction, but not a separation, of Christian morality from Christianity as a religion in which that morality is promoted and plays its part. It was not my task to discuss whether the traditional doctrines of the Trinity, of the incarnation of deity in Jesus Christ, of the bodily resurrection of Jesus (and others), are essential to Christianity as religion. What I have implied is that the nature and content of Christian ethics can be considered apart from them.

In this book, I do not reject the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus. What I say is: "This is not the place to discuss critically the dogma of the divinity of Jesus" (p. 161). It is acknowledged that it has sometimes been maintained that the doctrine of the Trinity implicates "an inner personal relationship of love in the nature of deity" (p. 161). But that is to associate love with a particular metaphysical description of deity, not to derive love from such description. One may reasonably accord the quality of love to God even if one ignores that doctrine. One writer goes so far as to say: "He also rejects the doctrine of the Trinity." I have done that neither in this nor any other published work, for that doctrine appears to me to involve the important metaphysical implication that deity is not an undifferentiated ultimate (as that in Herbert Spencer's philosophy) but is a differentiated unity. Nevertheless, I may frankly admit here that I find no adequate grounds for accepting the traditional doctrine in its identification of a specific appearance in human history with one of the differentiations.

Any writer on ethics may be expected to acknowledge, as I do, that man is defective. I do not, as one reviewer carelessly writes, deny the depravity of man, but his *total* depravity, as another rightly recognizes. A critic in the *Journal of Theology* (Nov., 1940) says:

> Whether man has in himself "any capacity to contribute to or hinder the achievement of a higher type of life" is to him an open question, for the New Testament is not clear on the subject, not having "any systematic inquiry into that question. Some passages emphasize the power and need of divine grace; others human responsibility." The problem of reconciling these two apparently contradictory doctrines seems perplexing for him. He finally rests his case on the statement of Paul that "God will render to all men according to their deeds."

But the earlier part of this statement refers to a section of my historical treatment, and it should not be inferred from it that I have no definite

position regarding the problem, nor that if I have one that it "rests" on a statement of Paul. Professor W. K. Wright in the *Journal of Religion* (Jan., 1941) says rightly: "He actually reaches his conclusions (almost all of which seem to me correct) not by appeals to authoritarian injunctions dogmatically accepted as the commandments of God, but through human reason and experience." My attitude to the present problem, based on reason and experience, is given in my summing up, from which I may be allowed to repeat two brief extracts: "Two things must be distinguished: the actuality of freedom as such and the limits of its operation." "The choice is left to man. Directly or indirectly God may urge but not compel him to choose the good. Having chosen it, he finds himself acting in co-operation with God and so has the support or 'grace' which that involves" (p. 154).

Dr. Bosley in *Christendom* (1940, p. 603) is also curiously inaccurate concerning my position with reference to morality and immortality, when he writes: "nor can we agree with him that the sanction of immortality is fundamental to an acceptance of the validity of love as an ethical principle." Actually I agree with what appears to be his implication. On p. 156, I maintain that moral values hold because of their intrinsic nature, "whether men's souls continue beyond death or not." In a chapter added to the sixth edition of Henry Sidgwick's *History of Ethics* (1931), I expressed my view thus: "It is the quality of life rather than its duration with which contemporary thought is mainly concerned. While it is being lived, the morally good is judged preferable to the morally evil, and this is not altered if life entirely ceases. . . ." Nevertheless, I affirm my own belief in personal immortality. Considering the moral ideal in its completeness, I would subscribe to the position of Rashdall as stated in the same page in Sidgwick: "The rationality of the ideal of morality seems bound up with the possibility of its attainment, and attainment is evidently not fully possible in the duration of an ordinary human life," that is, on earth. Of intrinsic worth as love is here and now, if it essentially involves a relation of persons as it appears to, then the realization of its perfection may reasonably be taken to require the continuance of persons.

Professor Brightman, with the clarity for which he is distinguished, raises an important subject for consideration when he comments (*Philosophic Abstracts,* Fall, 1940, p. 11) that "in spite of a chapter on 'The Concept of God,' the book is not explicit as to what differentiates Christian theism from a purely philosophical theism. Hence the concept of Christian Ethics remains indeterminate." I must indicate briefly the manner in which I accept the main implication of this statement. If we could suppose human history without the founders, leading teachers, and

institutions of particular religions, but dependent for the development of its ethical concepts on philosophical reflection on experience, I would expect the perfect ethics of a "pure philosophical theism" to be identical with what (otherwise with the presence of Christianity) would be perfect Christian ethics. While not claiming to have either a perfect Christian ethics or a perfect ethics of a philosophical theism, I consider their present differences to lie rather in their relative emphases than with reference to ultimate values or fundamental principles. But in actual history there have been particular religions. One of these, Christianity, has evolved an ethics, called "Christian ethics" simply because of the historical circumstances of its development. A somewhat different ethics has been elaborated, for example, in Islām. All ethics have appeared in historical circumstances, and philosophical reflection also must take as its data values historically experienced. I doubt whether the philosopher, developing a philosophical theism in any country, can leave out of account the ethical concepts of the theism (or theisms) of the historical religion (or religions) of that country. Christian ethics is "determinate" to the extent of the precision of its concepts of ultimate values and principles and of its relative emphases on these. I do not differentiate Christian theism from a purely philosophical theism by the admission for the former of certain distinctive Christological doctrines. Some do that, but I cannot see that to do so enables anyone to make Christian ethics more determinate than it is by its own content, nor that a "Christological theism," as such, provides ethical differences from the ethics of a purely philosophical theism. For some, Christological beliefs may have an effect on their moral life since the fact remains that Christian ethics is taught in Christian institutions and through Christian literature, and Christian morality is lived in association with Christian worship.

In dealing in so small a compass with the subject, historically, systematically, and considering practical applications, it was inevitable that much had to be omitted. The manuscript was cut down by sixteen thousand words that the book should be of a size for circulation rather than relegated for reference to library shelves. In drastic pruning, with self-denial I eliminated my own comments rather than sacrifice quotations from important historical figures. Even so, Gregory the Great had to be referred to as simply a "systematizer," and More's *Utopia* passed over in one sentence. Dr. Aubrey in the *Christian Century* (Aug. 7, 1940), besides mentioning these, calls attention to "the spiritualist reforming sects of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Genevan experiment in social ethics under Calvin, the utopian writings of (More), Bacon, and Campanella, and others, the weighty contributions of the Cambridge Platonists, and the Ritschlian moral theology." Dr. Bosley remarks that

I am "strangely silent on the ethical systems of non-Christian religions, notably, those of the Orient, and Judaism." In a volume of this size any reference to them could only be perfunctory and entirely inadequate.[1]

Of more immediate significance is the fact, adversely commented on, that I give no detailed discussion to the "antichristian" ideologies of communism, national socialism, and fascism. All these appear to me to be particular forms of the sociological and economic theories of morality, criticized in chapters viii and xi. They all involve the exaggeration of the significance of social wholes on the basis of a view of society which I regard as one of the leading errors of modern times. "Society"—with a capital *S*—is the "idol of the den" also of many American sociologists and even of not a few adherents to the *social gospel* movement. As an antidote to this poisonous conception, I present throughout the volume a Christian ethics of personal morality for which social relationships, though significant, are merely instrumental. The whole exposition should be considered as an aggressive *positive* attack on these ideologies.

It is, however, implied in my chapter xi that the economic organization which distinguishes communism cannot rightly be described as antichristian. A Christian communistic economics appears to me a distinct possibility. Dr. Charles A. Maddry in the *Pastor's Periscope* (Aug., 1940) says "under economics the conclusion is that the golden rule ought to be practiced. Very good, but not very definite." I find this last phrase somewhat surprising, because I know of little so definite as those things which I require for my own economic well-being. If I seriously apply the golden rule, I can arrive at an almost equal definiteness with regard to the demands of the economic welfare of others. The trouble is not in an indefiniteness in the golden rule but in that we rarely consider others with the definiteness with which we think of ourselves. On the other hand, if economic organization must depend, as I maintain, on circumstances of time and place, one should not describe any particular definite economic order as involved in Christian ethics. Though briefly, I have specifically criticized the kind of communism at present chiefly associated with Russia (pp. 263-4).

The particular form of the sociological error found in national socialism is bound up with a distinctive racial theory, which it needs no discussion to show is antichristian. Christian ethics accords no ethical significance to "blood" or race. But the *Führer* or *Leader* principle of national socialism and fascism cannot as such be declared antichristian.

[1] I have already written the greater part of a volume treating of Oriental ethics. I hope to publish it in the near future, but in the meantime I would send to anyone interested a list of my published articles in the field.

There is a sense in which Jesus is the Christian leader. He chose and commissioned his apostles. Though some features of democratic election of pastors and officials have been and are found in some Christian communities, actual practice in some of the most widespread churches has corresponded with the leadership principle. What is quite clearly anti-christian is that the leaders of national socialism and fascism have in their conduct violated many of the Christian virtues and in their utterances opposed the Christian moral ideal in detail.

There is much in my volume in criticism of modern humanism, but in view of the appearance in 1939, late on in my own writing, of Dr. Dakin's excellent study, *Man the Measure: An Essay on Humanism as Religion,* I omitted discussion of individual representatives. A writer in the *Standard,* (Jan., 1941) the organ of the American Ethical Union, dominantly humanistic, contends that I imply that "being in accord with the basic ideas of Christianity the [Ethical] Movement as such is a duplication of Christian ethics and therefore superfluous." He says my attitude reminds him "of the famous action ascribed to Caliph Omar who, with reference to the library at Alexandria, is said to have decided to destroy it on the following grounds: 'Either these books contain opinions that differ from the Koran, then they are dangerous and should be destroyed, or they agree with the teachings of the Koran, then they are almost superfluous and should be destroyed for this very reason.'" That is the type of misrepresentation to which the humanist resorts. Priding himself on his modernity, the criticism that arouses him most is that Christian ethics includes all values that he positively stands for. Expressed metaphorically, I nowhere suggest killing off those who have sight in only one eye. Even such may guide the entirely blind. But I believe that the vision of those with the sight of two eyes is normally less imperfect. It is pertinent to reiterate my contention that Christianity, involving what the late Dr. Gwatkin called "the eye for spiritual things," treats as secondary though essential the so-called "secular" which humanists appear *in general* to regard as primary, if not indeed as the whole of value. Actually my quotations show that some prominent leaders of the American Ethical Movement have had some appreciation of something beyond the merely "secular." Even a third of a loaf is better than no bread, and the Ethical Movement may do something to awaken and educate the moral capacities of some in our age blinded by the glare of modern natural science.

Though I have maintained that judged by reason and experience no ethics superior to Christian ethics has yet been offered to mankind, I am far from supposing that we have reached a perfect system. There are problems concerning which Christians have not yet given a satisfactory

answer. But non-Christians have not done so either. I give one example. Neither Christian nor non-Christian ethics has yet a satisfactory solution to the problem of the sex life for those who, especially women, owing to circumstances not under their control have no opportunity for marriage. While it is futile to pretend that there is no such problem, it may reasonably be held that owing to the slowness of moral progress the majority are not ready for any advance. For my own part, I am convinced that whatever policy be approved in the future, in the present the dangers both personal and social of any "free-love" type of solution seem so great that Christians may with good grounds continue their traditional attitude.

Of the reviews which have come to my attention, there remains one, by Mr. I. G. Whitchurch in the *Garrett Tower* (July, 1940) the most superficial I have read on any volume I have published. Its puerility demands exposure. Evidently I am not alone, for I am charged with what "is the root failure of writers on Christian ethics through the years." It is not surprising that in the last sentence but one he reveals his emotional disturbance, exclaiming: "How long, oh Lord, how long!" Notwithstanding his pseudo-philosophical pose, Mr. Whitchurch, clearly not understanding the problem involved, neither shows appreciation of, nor gives relevant criticism of, my way of dealing with it. The problem is that of absolute moral values and man's apprehension and expression of them in history. Such absolute values must constitute what he refers to as the normative. He writes: "The most important fact that emerges from this discussion is that Christian moral ideals are often self-contradictory, seldom consistent, and always lack systematic wholeness." I have insisted that as man has known and expressed the Christian moral ideal, he has not reached systematic wholeness, by which must be meant a unity with *all* constituent details. Confusing "Christian moral ideals" with some temporary aberrations in the modes of their conception and practical application, he may well talk of contradictions. That "considered historically and systematically Christianity has presented in general a consistent view of life as a whole" is a dominant contention of the book. In view of his self-revelation in what follows, I am not surprised that Mr. Whitchurch missed it.

Quoting me: "Christian ethics may be described as a theory of the mode or modes of life as lived in Christian institutions and as expressed in Christian literature, not of any specific period but of the whole course of Christian history," he comments, "So conceived Christian ethics becomes a loose name for a changing set of moral opinions." Can anyone, with the exception of Mr. Whitchurch, suppose that the Christian mode or modes of life through the ages has (have) been lived simply on the

basis of the sort of thing he suggests by "moral opinions," or that Christian literature, ethically considered, contains nothing other than such opinions? He asks: "Is not a Christian ethics so conceived a bit muddle-headed?" As he misinterprets it, most decidedly, yes,—more than a bit. He enquires further: "Can it be that we are more concerned that ethics be 'Christian' than that it be truthful?" Of course not: Dr. W. K. Wright in the passage already quoted above describes my standpoint. With such a question Mr. Whitchurch gives a false impression of my attitude. "Does truth and validity really count here?" There is as little need to say "Yes" to that question as there was to ask it. "To slur over this normative issue in Christian ethics is to miss its deepest intent." Then why did he slur over it in my exposition? Like a college sophomore, finding no labelled "Discussion of Truth and Validity in Christian Ethics," he could not discover that the normative is a fundamental consideration of the whole treatment. Jesus and the great saints and teachers in their lives and utterances implicated definite positions with regard to "truth and validity," even if they never referred to them in those terms.

Such Christian ethics, he declares, "functions as an amplifier of conventional respectabilities. Of course, conventional norms manage to embody a modicum of truth. But how costly has it proven to confuse a candle light with the rays from a noon-day sun!" What or who is this "noon-day sun"? To me it is "Deity," who is or supplies the norm, as I state: "He is the objective basis involved in our apprehension of moral good" (p. 169). "Moral values as ultimate in the divine Being and absolute in the ideal for man are consistent with a relativism of moral rules of conduct contingent on circumstances" (p. 175). Who has ever claimed to express, in terms for man in history, the fullness of the moral perfection of this "noon-day sun"? Yet Mr. Whitchurch implies that what I have recorded from the New Testament and the later history of Christianity constitutes just "moral opinions," "conventional respectabilities." What tests are there of "truth and validity" for man other than experience and reason? Did not Jesus, did not other saints, experience the "noon-day sun"? Did not Christian teachers use their reason? Do not their utterances express ultimate values and not merely "moral opinions"? Entranced by the "noon-day sun," does Mr. Whitchurch never attempt any expression—not merely of "moral opinions"—but of fundamental moral principles and intrinsic ultimate values? If he thinks he can express the norm, the "noon-day sun," more satisfactorily than by bringing together what the founder and the greatest minds of Christianity have offered, then he should be challenged to do so. How long are we to wait for that, Mr. Whitchurch, how long?

THE TONGUES OF MEN, OR OF ANGELS?

JOHN CHILTON SCAMMELL

Boston University

SOMEWHERE this evening your favorite radio commentator will sit down before a microphone and talk to you; at times you will feel as if he were actually talking not only to you but with you. Or perhaps some statesman or some sports reporter holds your mind in his grasp, calls up visions of battling nations or competing ball players, or else a critic or a raconteur may enlighten or charm you as the invisible companion of your home and your family.

Invisible—*vox, et præterea nihil?* Not so! But, rather, a voice that needs no visible or outward sign of an undoubted reality, that already possesses a reality of intimate potency—a voice of friendliness, sincere and understanding, taking its place in your home by your consent and with your welcoming attention.

Whether the speaker be critic, king, sportsman, journalist, statesman, historian, poet, or teller of tales—he is welcome on his own account; for, if not, you would discard him and find another to take his place. A twist of the knob, the least touch of your thumb and finger, and he is banished.

What is the secret of his acceptability to you and so many of your friends? What elements does he blend that produce discourse so well in harmony with your home? Is his seemingly spontaneous talk actually unpremeditated, artless, "natural"?

Hardly! Even though he possess a ready mind and a pleasant voice, nevertheless he must take thought before he sits down to the microphone and begins to speak to you. He must have considered you as well as his subject, and also his own best means of dealing with both those prime factors. Even though he cannot explain how he makes himself felt as a personage worth hearing, he has certainly adjusted himself to his theme and to his audience; unconsciously, in large part automatically, we might almost say; but more probably he has learned through years of increasing ability to select those traits of his that best enable him to think soundly and utter his thoughts pleasingly.

Now this subtle and effective technique must surely excite the interest and the curiosity of the preacher. And as the writer has had occasion to make inquiry into the radio talker's methods and manners, he here presents certain findings for the preacher's consideration.

But first of all let it be admitted that the preacher is generally a pastor, and that the latter function is the more inclusive. To recognize

what relationship may be pertinent between radio talk and preaching it is necessary to reflect upon the nature and purpose of the pastoral life. Wherefore, look rather carefully at the assertion that now follows, and the conclusions drawn therefrom.

"It is fair to say that pastors are magnanimous." What is the purport of this compliment? Is it to be viewed with mistrust? Can it be that this remark is intended to "damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer"?

No, not that. However, it prefaces a suggestion, in fact a plea for a hearing; and, as a preface, this remark is to be the foundation on which the argument, or plea, is established.

Consider the chief terms in the statement: "fair," "pastors," and "magnanimous."

"Fair" implies three factors or elements. And these provide the reasons for writing this article for a theological review. First, the word naturally implies a reasonable and somewhat generous attitude; a desire to give credit where credit is due. Second, it connotes the standpoint of a spectator, one who looks on and reports what he sees from a position outside the arena; not as a partisan, nor even as one who expects to oppose one or another of the participants. Third, it signifies ability to appraise the merits of the spectacle; to express a considered opinion based on adequate knowledge of the circumstances, and phrased in terms selected with due thoughtfulness.

In the present instance, may it please the reader, such a spectator is attempting just such a report. For the writer, to begin with, is not a pastor, though closely bound by heritage and conviction to those who are. And, to go on with, for more than a decade he has been occupied during almost all his spare time with experiment and study in talking "on the air." Consequently he is much concerned with effective discourse as a means of eliciting understanding response from listeners of many moods and modes of life; and abroad as well as at home. The preaching duties of the pastor are so closely allied to this avocation of his, and he has been so deeply interested in the search for the qualities that have contributed to the distinction that some speakers have attained in their broadcasts, that he ventures to offer a "considered opinion" worded in terms that result from conferences, observation, and practice associated with authorities in this country and overseas. Finally, he seeks to be reasonable and generous as well; but on that point the reader must decide for himself.

Let us pass on, then, to the second term in the introductory remark, *i.e.*, "pastors." The pastor is here regarded as an ecclesiast who by spiritual vocation, specific training, and the approval of a congregation lives and works for the more abundant life of the community. The

character of the term, "pastor," as it relates to the present discussion is summed up in the adjective, "magnanimous," which is now to be examined.

"Magnanimous" has for its simple and original equivalent the expression, "great-hearted." Simple though it be, its simplicity is that of a noble harmony, a grace compact of many virtues. To be magnanimous is to be big, broad, happy, and willing. Big enough to ignore oneself; broad enough to recognize and admit many points of view, to sympathize with moods and manners that often contravene one another—discordant notes that require the skill of no inept musician to resolve into effective polyphony; happy in a troubled and evil world and in spite of that evil and trouble and the anxieties and dilemmas that they impose upon him; willing to attempt whatever he may perceive awaiting his attention, to strive to serve the needs of anyone at any time. Pastors not only should be such folk; they are. Each of us can name specimens. They are poorly, often wretchedly paid, in this world's goods; yet they forget their own needs in beholding the needs of others. They hear and see opposing opinions and actions in their own congregations, and yet they persist in striving to unite these dissentient forces and render their vigor serviceable for the common cause and faith. They seek for the means, in current terms and outlook, of guiding the divers activities of business and domesticity and of learning and pastime, as well as of modern ideas and ideals, toward a path that offers spiritual fellowship. They find happiness in this pursuit, they extract pleasure from it as well as fatigue and discouragement and confession of their own shortcomings. They are willing to strive for unity and progress among the intricate and seemingly trivial miscellany of guilds, bazaars, sewing circles, missionary societies, girls' clubs, boys' clubs, training courses, suppers, camp groups, clerical meetings, board and committee meetings, financial drives, membership drives, local conferences, national conventions, administrative rulings—all the multifold omnium-gatherum of this day's ecclesiastical instrumentation and material—they actually aim at a unity in all this commixture that shall be strong, elastic, stainless, and enduring, an alloy malleable to the shaping that time and the age will impose, yet of worthy and useful metal.

Such an attempt, in such a spirit, compels respect. Such a life of daily rounds and common tasks for the maintenance of a spirit of otherwordliness might well be regarded as either fanatical or futile or both. Yet it is neither. It is for the most part looked upon as a natural course to follow, a "vocation" to be expected and to be desired, a part of the social service to which every community is axiomatically entitled.

Time was when the minister had the reverential deference of the

community; he walked apart although among his neighbors; his weekday speech and deeds evinced the dignity of spiritual eminence and authority; he presided over the vital needs of immortal souls with visitation and counsel and admonition and prayer. And in that day he not infrequently devoted a large part of his time to scholarly thought and writing; not only in theology and churchmanship but in philosophy, history, mathematics, and other learned speculation he studied and worked and published. Nor did he pass lightly over the searching of his own heart; he sat by the watercourses of Reuben and examined himself and sought light and strength in "recollection."

Not so today. The contrast between pastoral care nowadays and the cure of souls in those times is striking, even startling.

At this point, however, it should be admitted that both then and now not a few ministers and pastors fell short of the standards that have just been contrasted. They were, and are, either "zealous overmuch" or else "lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot"—inept.

Still further, clergy and laymen alike are gravely concerned today, because so few apt students desire to enter the ministry; and they rightly fear lest the churches lapse into the status of minor associations, available to the "joiners" but not authoritative or commanding, merely providing for people who like that kind of thing the kind of thing they like.

This danger occasions the suggestions that now follow. For the attention of the general public is more concentrated upon the pastor as preacher than upon his other functions. His weekday duties are manifold, beyond question, but they are private, in that they are all but entirely confined within the limits of his official congregation and require him to cope with evervarying circumstances none of which directly concern or interest the public as a whole. His presence at a guild meeting or at a boys' camp or a sickbed or a committee session or a wedding offers to the general public little or no conviction of the reality of his faith as a vital element for others as well as for himself, as a studied and highly intelligent principle of abundant and notable living. Only as a preacher can the pastor find the opportunity to get the attention of the community centred upon the realities to which his other functions give but occasional and diffuse evidence.

And, furthermore, if there be any merit in the analogy between radio talk, classroom lecture, and ministerial sermon, only in the conscientious and painstaking task of preparing thorough and sanely appealing statements of one's major theme and its variations can broadcast talker, professor, or pastor find adequate means to determine what his vocation means and why he is entitled to continue it. As far as broadcasting "talk" is concerned, the masters of that form of discourse, consciously

and unconsciously, have developed a technique that allows for a wide scope and range of individual gifts and weaknesses, yet one that rests upon definite principles. These principles, it is irritating to note, have received little attention in the texts and other instruction in rhetoric or composition or public speaking.

The first of them, in order as well as importance, is *reflection—meditation.* Reflection upon what is to be said, and to whom, and by whom —there is the fundamental need, the *sine qua non.* Beneath the surface of the mind as well as on the upper level of conscious and purposeful thought there must be this turning the subject over and over, viewing it from this position and that, with gradual selection and arrangement of data and evidence, evolving continuity and progression, always with the threefold adaptation to theme, audience, and one's own mode and manner of speech. Days and even weeks, sometimes months, of such gestation are customary even with radio talkers who are on the air daily; they have no illusions of "genius" but concede and, indeed, maintain that "infinite capacity for taking pains" is inescapable, they find that they cannot do otherwise.

One observes such a craftsman absorbed in this labor and then can but marvel that a pastor produces any discourse of merit in the midst of the incessant calls upon him for thought and action so remote from studied preparation, so inimical to meditation. One remembers reading of the mystics and the "eminent divines" of other years, and their "practice of the presence of God"; seclusion, not for an hour or two, but daily, was their duty, nay, their inescapable necessity, if they were to live aright. And so, today, one can find eminent broadcasters shut off from any interruption or invasion, alone for the most part, occasionally with attendant disciple-secretaries, immersed in meditation, at times attaining "contemplation," not mystics, nor even scholars, yet convinced by tested experience that only such withdrawal from the world can enable them to produce fit and acceptable words of wisdom.

To reflect in such fashion requires study and practice of three prime factors.

1. There is the subject itself, the theme; it must be viewed as part and parcel of a continuum, and likewise as a "thing in itself," a unit or topic to be rendered complete and comprehensible. Manifestly this subject imposes limits, and, in turn, must be limited. It must be capable of brief treatment in simple, familiar language. It demands that one stick to the point and follow a reasonably direct path to a sound and practicable position or conclusion. And, for the pastor as preacher, it must distinctly belong within the province of the spiritual life—a life transcendent, in which earthly experience serves but as an outward and visible sign of

an inward and spiritual truth, a truth more than ethical or moral, not only good, but glorious, not only sane, but inspiring; orderly, but on the order of the heavenly; concerned with the present era, but eternal in its urge to ennoble what worth there may be in this era.

2. The audience also imposes limits. Even the broadcasting talker has found that he must reach the hearts of his listeners; that is to say, their minds will not heed him unless their emotional response to him is favorable. All of us from time to time reject a radio speaker, tune him out and seek some more attractive program; not his subject has repelled us, but some effect as of artificiality in his manner, suggestive of affectation or insincerity. So often there is a feeling that he is talking to someone else, probably to himself, for he is uttering convictions in the terms and with the reasoning that have convinced him, stating the views as he sees them without recognizing that these differ considerably from the views of his less informed listeners, that he is talking about what interests him rather than seeking to make that theme interesting to us. And so we radio listeners turn away from him and search for some program nearer to our wants.

What do we want? Not, perhaps, what we need; there, at least, is the ready reply of many teachers, doctors, lawyers, and a good many preachers, too. They insist that our needs mainly require treatment and nutrition that is bound to be distasteful; that algebra, or a plain diet, or concession to the rulings of the court—all unpleasant to the great majority—that these and similar courses of treatment are necessary and must forthwith be administered.

But, what of the manner of administering these? Is the victim to have no say in that respect? He is sure of one thing, *i.e.*, that he knows what he wants, and he believes that it can be provided in a pleasing fashion. What he wants is a friend; he wants to be helped and comforted and strengthened and encouraged. He does not want to feel baffled or starved or cheated. He wants to be understood, and to be handled understandingly; to be dealt with by someone who cares enough about him to take the pains to understand him and his troubles; and he does not want, he deeply resents, being treated as an "average" or typical and hence unindividualized impersonality.

Johnny does not enjoy or "take to" algebra simply because some thirty other boys and girls in the classroom are compelled to be fellow sufferers. Mr. Brown, or Mrs. Brown, neither of them relish a prescribed diet just because sundry scores of other folk are forced to abide by it. Mr. Jones does not take pleasure in conforming to a judicial decision because all others in such circumstances must likewise accept that ruling. To be handled as a "case" gratifies no one. It is of all human

treatments the most negative. Better to be ignored than to be regarded as an occupant of one of a couple of hundred chairs, all alike. Each of us knows he is not identical with those others; none of us thinks of himself as identical with the rest of any group; we decline to think of ourselves in general terms; we will not do so, save when compelled to bow to authority that we cannot reject or overthrow.

Whatever the subject may be, then, broadcasters of the first rank are well aware that it must be presented by a friend. And a friend, as the urchin said, "is a guy that knows all about yuh, an' likes yuh just the same!" Who knows all about you—there is the clue. The pastor is just that person; not that he knows as much as your family or your neighbors, but he knows you in a better perspective, he sees you near at hand but in relation to scores of others, and hence he can and usually does appraise your merits and defects more justly and with less prejudice than either your intimates or those remote from you.

Yet in the pulpit the pastor is veiled in the role of the preacher; the friend yields place to the authoritative or professional public speaker; tone, language, rhythm, and pace, and substance or content as well, all are so changed, so seemingly affected or "pulpitized" that listeners are again and again impelled to feel as Mary did. "They have taken away my Lord!"

In all reverence and humility let us consider the Lord's mode of preaching. How vividly we recall the parables, how firmly they are fixed as guideposts that mark the paths to height after height upon the Pilgrim's Way! They are the tales of a friend! They deal with the homely and familiar habits and happenings of your life and mine; their message cannot be mistaken; their appeal is intimately touching; and their worth is incomparable. So, too, with those more cryptic sayings, for they are so manifestly uttered by one who is moved by the needs and yet by the wants of his neighbors, who knows how to stir their curiosity and then lift them to the contemplation of sublime truth; he knows their hearts and loves them, and his words reveal knowledge in terms of that kindly affection and compassion.

How much time and thought, what close observation and appreciative selection these simple allegories and challenging paradoxes must have demanded. The Man of Sorrows beheld the throng of Vanity Fair; he pondered on their meaning and upon the means by which that meaning might be made luminous and imperative. And then when he showed these things to the people they heard him gladly and followed him as King of Kings and the Good Shepherd, even before his passion. That he was acquainted with grief—their griefs as well as his own, and those moods of theirs which were grievous, though they could not perceive their

grievousness;—also that he considered the lilies of the field; that he fed those about him and was fed by them, and was known of them, at last, in the breaking of bread; in all these and many kindred acts and words of their own familiar world he won their hearts and has won ours. Our faith in him, like theirs, has been infinitely amplified by the mystery of the cross, but our affection and our trust and our hope, like theirs, abide in him as our fellow and our friend.

Skilled radio talkers have recognized these qualities and discuss them with the appreciative interest that their own study of discourse has aroused. As several of them have remarked in conversations upon the means of holding their listeners, this friendly intimacy with the listeners' world and interests and understanding has of necessity been their prime object of study and attention. And they have discovered for themselves that the selfsame quality that listeners value in radio talks is that which so clearly identifies the teaching of Jesus—recognition of the requirements that listeners prescribe for the speaker.

3. The speaker's own nature and habits impose yet other limits upon him. Doubtless he is many-sided; and of these various aspects of himself, which is the one that promises the greatest success? The answer still is, that self, that phase or aspect of him which his friends most enjoy—the personality that they respect and love; respect because of his knowledge and trustworthiness; love because of his frank and straightforward intimacy and charm.

Consequently the more effective radio talkers use the tones, diction, and general manner that their friends are accustomed to; figuratively, and even literally, these talkers feel "at home" in the radio studio; and this feeling is sensed by the listeners. For the talker is using the very manner and style that have become most completely his own, in which he is most at ease, and which most readily and quickly appeal to others. In other words, the humility, sincerity, and conviction of any of us are most apparent when we are speaking among friends. Whatever our faults, provided we have any worth, they are pardoned because of our fundamental earnestness and genuineness and our freedom from pose or assumption of superiority. "Be faithful to yourself—your best and most likeable self" is the counsel of one of the most successful directors of radio talk programs; be faithful to the trust and confidence your listeners desire to place in you; be faithful to the friendliness that they desire to manifest toward you; be faithful to the truths that you perceive emergent from the data of your subject; be faithful to your knowledge of your own imperfections; and be faithful to your colleagues in your vocation.

These three factors, then, constitute the elements of the reflective, meditative thought that outstanding radio talkers find essential to their success.

Beside this essential of right meditation there is another, that of *clarity*. The term is used in its widest implication, yet with the one restriction that it refers always to the listeners, that their ease of reception and absorption constitutes the one criterion that determines clarity. Analysis of broadcasting discourse of the higher order shows that such clarity may be said to consist of breadth, variety, distinctiveness, employability, and credibility.

These are qualities of intellectual rather than of linguistic character; for as far as diction is concerned, no more need be said than has so often been advised by teachers and critics, *viz.*, that choice of words, phrasing, and utterance require simplicity and straightforwardness together with freedom from monotony or affectation. It might further be added that radio talkers take pains to gather comments upon their manners of speech and hearken willingly to the suggestions of their listeners; rehearsal, revision, the whole technique of editing scripts and spoken style as well are part and parcel of radio program construction and presentation.

Returning to the intellectual virtue of clarity and the elements that have just been listed; these likewise might be regarded as reasonably obvious, were it not for the fact that one seldom if ever encounters them in manuals or guides to effective writing or speech.

The writer would not venture to insist upon them if they had not compelled him to take note of them repeatedly in the course of his studies, for he had yielded, like most people, to the impression that his schooling in English composition had surely covered the ground sufficiently. As far as breadth and variety are in question, the academic instruction probably is sufficient. Most of us both recognize their value and put them into practice quite spontaneously. Doubtless it suffices to mention them in passing and forthwith enlarge somewhat upon the other three elements.

Distinctiveness, then, is the quality that enables listeners to distinguish an idea, to view it as well-nigh concrete and certainly as objective, integrated in itself, and separated from its neighboring thought or context though not divorced therefrom. The speaker must not assume too readily that this individual coherence, so clear to him, is equally lucid to his listeners; his very familiarity with the idea, especially after spending hours of thought upon it and its contextual neighbors, may well have made him familiar with it to the extent that he quite forgets the comparative ignorance or inexperience of his listeners when they are suddenly asked to deal with it.

Employability, the second of these three items or factors, assists in securing this distinctive quality, for it rules that an idea must be so presented that it can be used by the minds of the listeners, just as their hands use tools. The idea must be such that they perceive its use, in the first place, and can grasp it with their minds, in the second. It must not strike them as foreign or otherwise obscure, even though it be new or fresh to them. It must fit their needs, be adapted to their actual experience and practice, and all the more so if it has not hitherto been handled by them or before their eyes.

Credibility, the last of the three, follows as a corollary to its predecessors. For an idea can hardly be regarded as distinguishable nor as employable unless the mind can accept it as reliable. It is here that so many people have been offended by scholars throughout the ages; on the one hand because scholars rightly concern themselves with exploration and discovery and the announcement of their findings, which by definition are new and hitherto unperceived, probably rather strange, and quite possibly obscure, formidable, and repelling; on the other hand because scholars rather justly feel that their findings must first of all be stated in terms that will enable other scholars to weigh and appraise and use them, with the consequence that the public can make little or nothing of the special terminologies and processes required for such presentation, and are offended and baffled by the less just attitude of many scholars, namely, that these discoveries are not susceptible of interpretation to the multitude and that attempts to "popularize" learning are opprobrious and unworthy of the service of truth.

On both these counts injury is done to the layman. He feels incompetent, and presently he begins to feel suspicious; he finds that explanation is generally denied him; he cannot but assume that the learned authority ought to be able to give him an explanation and that this denial is an act of indifference or else of scorn; meanwhile he learns from the press and other common sources that the learned are not in agreement on these matters. That is enough; he becomes either an indifferent Gallio or else a downright opponent of such obscurantism; he finds himself looking across a gulf toward the learned and turns away both alarmed and frustrated. The public deserve better treatment; and when they receive it they are grateful and spread the good tidings of the bringer of such good news.

In conclusion, these experiences and practical achievements of radio talkers are cognate to the problems of the preacher. Modern critical study of the origins and history of the Bible, the churches, and the faith is admittedly the conduct of explorations that involve techniques and terminologies that the layman cannot possibly cope with. Yet the subject

of all this intricate learning is the conduct of life itself, the quest for nobler living. How gravely we are in need of such learning! How imperative is the duty of the clergy to shed whatever light they can upon the path of righteousness!

Hence, then, the title of this article. The tongues of men, *viz.,* our best radio talkers; and those of angels, *viz.,* the appointed bringers of the message of the spirit; both of these useful and notable groups of speakers must be informed with the greatest of the virtues, the kindly understanding and thoughtful affection that should be constantly with us—charity.

MISSION FINANCE IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

FREDERICK M. DERWACTER

William Jewell College

Missionary propaganda by traveling preachers dates from the earliest days of Christianity. Jesus himself is represented in the gospels as traveling about Palestine and as supplementing his own labors with that of itinerant disciples. Yet the matter of support, which is such a persistent problem in modern missionary enterprise, is barely mentioned in the records. While Jesus is said to have had the trade of a carpenter, there is no indication that he worked at his trade during his ministry. When his disciples "left all" and followed him, it is in some passages specifically mentioned that they left their previous means of livelihood.[1] A group of women is referred to as having "ministered unto them (*i.e.*, to Jesus and his disciples) of their substance."[2] The detailed instructions which Jesus gave his disciples as he sends them forth in a concerted missionary effort[3] anticipate their reception into households in the towns to which they come and their subsistence on the basis of local hospitality. Jesus' own practice was to send messengers ahead to villages along the way to prepare for entertainment. On such occasions he and his disciples were sometimes hospitably received, sometimes harshly rejected. In the latter case "they went to another village."[4]

The early part of Acts relates a series of missionary activities carried on by Christian leaders working from Jerusalem as a centre. Philip is active in Samaria, where he is reënforced later by Peter and John; Peter is in Lydda and Joppa; Philip then pursues his mission on the road to Gaza and down on the seacoast. The question of support for these workers does not arise in the record. The financial issue that is present in this part of Acts is rather that of general support for the poor, under which lies the policy of mutual helpfulness as the obligation of all toward the whole Christian community. Even when Paul is brought from Tarsus to serve at Antioch,[5] and later when he and Barnabas are sent out on extended missionary tours,[6] though in the latter case there is formal laying on of hands by the leaders in Antioch, nothing is said in either case as to their support.

We may be reasonably sure that the church at Jerusalem, from which

[1] Mark 1: 18, 20 and parallels; Luke 5: 28.
[2] Luke 8: 2-3.
[3] Mark 6: 7-11; Matt. 10: 5-15; Luke 9: 1-5; 10: 1-16.
[4] Luke 9: 52-56; cf. Mark 14: 14-16 and parallels.
[5] Acts 11: 25-26.
[6] *E.g.*, Acts 13: 2-3.

many early missionary workers issued, assumed no financial responsibility for them. In fact, the Jerusalem community is repeatedly pictured as poor in the extreme. As early as Acts 11 : 29 we find the group of disciples in Antioch sending help to their brethren in Jerusalem in famine time, and one prominent interest of Paul during his extensive evangelizing work about the Ægean was gathering contributions for the relief of the poor at Jerusalem.[7]

Paul makes it clear in I Corinthians[8] that in connection with his missionary work he continued to labor as an artisan. According to Acts, Paul lived in Corinth with a Jewish believer named Aquila and worked with him at their common trade of tentmaking.[9] Elsewhere, too, he labored "night and day," to quote his own words to the Thessalonian Christians,[10] that he "might not burden" any of them. Our last picture of Paul presents him in Rome, still financially independent, "in his own hired dwelling."[11]

No other Christian itinerant is clearly said to have had a trade and to have contributed to the support of himself and of his work in this way. However, it is quite conceivable that this was true of others. It is certainly implied of Barnabas.[12] We meet the tentmaker Aquila and his wife Priscilla later in Ephesus, evidently engaged in evangelistic work, for the record says that they confirmed and instructed Apollos,[13] and later still, if the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is an integral part of the original letter, we find them in Rome, presumably similarly engaged.[14]

The account which Josephus gives of contemporary Jewish itinerant propagandists[15] should be compared with the record of Christian evangelization. He supplies us with the interesting fact that at least one of these preachers of Judaism, the one who succeeded in winning over a king to the Jewish faith, was a "Jewish merchant." Thus we find "trade and propaganda hand in hand"[16] among the Jews, and though we have little direct evidence it is reasonable to suppose that this policy prevailed, perhaps to a considerable extent, among early Christians who pioneered for their new faith among dispersion Jews of the Roman world.[17]

[7] I Cor. 16; II Cor. 8-9.
[8] I Cor. 4:12.
[9] Acts 18: 3.
[10] I Thes. 2: 9; II Thes. 3: 8.
[11] Acts 28: 30.
[12] I Cor. 9: 6.
[13] Acts 18: 18-26.
[14] Rom. 16: 3.
[15] *Antt.* 20, 2, 2-4.
[16] Cruickshank, "Proselyte, Proselytism" in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. X, p. 400.
[17] For fuller study of Jewish and Christian propaganda, see Derwacter, *Preparing the Way for Paul*, Macmillan, 1930.

Paul himself gratefully acknowledges help given him by the church at Philippi,[18] but the way in which he acknowledges it indicates that it is unusual. "And ye yourselves also know, ye Philippians," he says, "that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church had fellowship with me in the matter of giving and receiving but ye only" (v. 15). Paul reminds the church at Corinth with great emphasis that he has not taken any money from them in connection with his preaching.[19] It has been his "glory," he asserts, to "make the gospel without charge" (v. 18). He does, however, call to their attention the fact that while in Corinth some of his needs were met by the brethren who "came from Macedonia."[20] This refers, of course, to that Philippian church which Goodspeed calls "the first church of which we have any knowledge which put money into Christian missions."[21] The passage demonstrates clearly that Paul's policy of working at his trade cannot be taken as excluding free-will gifts from certain groups and individuals.

Moreover, in Paul's assertions of personal financial independence[22] there are implications that have important bearing on the general question of support. He insists that, although he does not exercise it, he has the same *right* of support that the other apostles have. After some extended argument from human experience and from the law, he concludes, "Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel" (v. 14). The context of this passage shows that the support of Christian workers was expected of the church which they served. Paul directly charges this upon the Galatian Christians: "But let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things."[23] He does not want his practice of self-support taken as a precedent. He rather regards it as a personal privilege. Whether this included his party we do not know. Schaff, in his *History of the Apostolic Church,*[24] argues that Paul's party was so large that he could not have earned enough to support them all. Unfortunately he refers to the list in Acts 20: 3-4, in which certainly some of the persons named do not belong to his regular party, but are church delegates accompanying the special offering which is being taken to Jerusalem.[25]

The current saying, "The laborer is worthy of his hire (food)," which we find imbedded in the Gospels of Matthew[26] and Luke[27] and

[18] Phil. 4: 10-18.
[19] I Cor. 9:12-18.
[20] II Cor. 11: 9.
[21] E. J. Goodspeed, *The Story of the New Testament,* p. 37.
[22] I Cor. 9.
[23] Gal. 6: 6.
[24] Pp. 503-506.
[25] I Cor. 16: 3-4.
[26] Matt. 10: 10.
[27] Luke 10: 7.

in I Timothy 5:18 reflects no doubt the practice prevalent in the latter part of the first century. We find no reference to any church sending out at its own expense any itinerant workers. Such workers had their living where they served and their entertainment *en route* in the homes of believers along the way.[28] Luke gives us a hint of how Paul was entertained, for example, in Philippi,[29] in Jerusalem,[30] and again of how Peter was entertained in Joppa.[31] That abuses arose in connection with this custom of entertainment is evident from the *Didache*.[32] That the faithful should be imposed upon was almost inevitable in view of the informal and unofficial nature of the work. It is a situation not altogether unknown today. But all the experience with imposters does not prevent the author from reiterating the general working rule: "But every true prophet who will settle among you is worthy of his support. Likewise, a true teacher, he also is worthy, like the workman, of his support."[33] This only makes plainer the fact that hospitality for the Christian worker on his way and support for the resident worker were matters of course.

Early missionary effort was, therefore, so far as we can gather from the records, on the basis of "self-support," in the sense that the itinerant worker went out with his gospel trusting that it was such good news that he would find a hospitable welcome among the people to whom he came. In a world that prized hospitality as one of the greatest virtues,[34] he did find such a welcome, and he made warm and devoted friends who followed his later travels with interest, ministered to him in times of special need, and sped on their way other ministers who passed by on similar errands. Doubtless some men plied their trades as they preached, or they preached as they plied their trades. These, however, were the exceptions. The laborer was reckoned worthy of his support. The element in the modern missionary set-up which is conspicuous by its absence in the Apostolic Age is organized support from a financial home base.

[28] Cf. III John 7.
[29] Acts 16:15.
[30] Acts 21:16.
[31] Acts 9:43; 10:32.
[32] *Did.* 11-13.
[33] *Did.* 13:1-2.
[34] See articles "Hospitality" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* and *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.*

SOME RECENT ENGLISH BOOKS IN CHURCH HISTORY

JOHN T. McNEILL
University of Chicago

It is difficult for a teacher of church history to keep abreast of the growing literature in his field. In 1931 *A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Christianity* by S. J. Case and others was published by the University of Chicago Press. I believe each of the contributors to that volume would now acknowledge that in the decade which has since intervened his selections on many topics have become antiquated. The present article does not, of course, attempt to survey the entire range of fresh studies through this decade of production. It is only intended to call attention to a few of the more useful works in English published since 1935, which treat aspects of the history of mediæval and modern Christianity in the Eastern Hemisphere and more especially in Europe. A few translated works are included.

We may first make note of some of the numerous attempts that have been made to present the history of Christianity in a single volume or in several miniature volumes in series. A. G. Baker has edited *A Short History of Christianity* (University of Chicago Press, 1940), a textbook in eight chapters, each subdivided into four lessons. There are six contributors, each of whom has treated the field of his specialization as a teacher. Caroline M. Duncan-Jones edits a useful coöperative series of four small volumes, *An Outline of Church History to the Reformation* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1938-39), the materials of which are from radio talks by experts. E. R. Hardy in *Militant in Earth* (Oxford Press, 1940) has taken as his theme "the frontier of the church and the world," and has presented a thoughtful outline of the expansion of Christianity. D. C. Somervell's *A Short History of Our Religion* (London: G. Bell, 1936) begins with Moses.

Among books of this class by Roman Catholics may be mentioned the translation by E. Kaiser of the fourth German edition of the competent textbook by J. Lortz, *A History of the Church* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938), and *A Popular History of the Church* (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1939, reissued 1940 as *A Popular History of the Catholic Church*) by Philip Hughes. Dr. Hughes is the author of a larger work, still incomplete, *The History of the Church,* Volume II, (London: Sheed and Ward, 1935) of which covers the period from Augustine to Aquinas. In the same class is R. F. Walker's two-volume sketch, *An Outline History of the Catholic Church* (Dublin: Gill, 1938-39).

The more ecumenical view which church historians are beginning to take of their field is well represented by the work of K. S. Latourette, whose *History of the Expansion of Christianity* (Volumes I to IV, Harper, 1937-41) achieves a kind of geographic emancipation from the old absorption in Western European affairs, tends greatly to enhance appreciation of Christianity's modern growth and strength, and so sets the whole Christian movement in new perspective. Latourette's *Anno Domini* (Harper, 1940) has for its theme the influence of Jesus, as distinct from ecclesiastical forces, upon thought and action through the centuries. In *Highways of Christian Doctrine* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1936) S. J. Case has interpreted Christian thought movements in relation to social backgrounds. C. C. Richardson in *The Church through the Centuries* (Scribner, 1938) has indicated the main stages in the evolution of Christian teaching concerning the church. Under the title, *Creative Conflicts in Christianity* (Revell, 1938) G. W. Richards has discussed historic crises in doctrine. F. J. Foakes-Jackson's *A History of Church History* (Cambridge: Heffer, 1939) treats selected topics in ecclesiastical historiography.

In addition to the works of Latourette and Hardy, noted above, aspects of missionary history have been explored by J. T. Addison in *The Medieval Missionary* (New York: International Missionary Committee, 1936), by C. J. Oppermann in *English Missionaries in Sweden and Finland* (London: SPCK, 1937) and by J. Foster in *The Church of the T'Ang Dynasty* (London: SPCK, 1939). H. P. Van Dusen in *For the Healing of the Nations* (Scribner, 1940) has shown the historic connection of the conferences of Oxford, Edinburgh, and Madras; and has reported favorably on his extended observations of missions at work in the Orient.

The series, *Makers of Christianity* (New York: Holt), edited by S. J. Case, who wrote the first volume, *From Jesus to Charlemagne* (1934), contains also *From Alfred the Great to Schleiermacher* (1935) by the present writer, and one on American church leaders by W. W. Sweet (1937). These volumes are mainly biographical but exhibit also the chief phases of the church's development. Somewhat edifying for Roman Catholic readers are the thirty-seven short biographical sketches edited by C. Williamson in *Great Catholics* (Macmillan, 1939). Similarly inspirational are the stories of fifteen Christian leaders, including a number of Protestants, in *Founders of Christian Movements* (New York: Association Press, 1941) by P. H. Lotz. The biographical approach is made for younger readers in H. M. P. Davidson's *Good Christian Men* (Scribner, 1941). Here it may be remarked that a good many books of church history have been written for beginners and for

the young. In this connection may be mentioned Vera E. Walker's *First Church History* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1936), and (for juveniles) R. H. Bainton's amply illustrated *The Church of Our Fathers* (Scribner, 1941).

For the period with which we are here specially concerned certain works on background material have an importance that calls for their mention. H. A. L. Fisher's thoughtful three-volume *History of Europe* (1935) has been reprinted in one volume (Houghton, Mifflin, 1939). *An Introduction to Medieval Europe, 300-1500* (New York: Norton, 1937) by J. W. Thompson and E. N. Johnson, with contributions on the history of England by G. W. Grey, is an ample volume of high merit. *A History of Europe from the Invasions to the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Norton, 1939) is a translation by B. Miall of the eighth French edition of H. Pirenne's celebrated history first written from memory while the Belgian historian was a prisoner of war. W. W. Cash summarizes Christianity's relations with its most vigorous rival in *Christianity and Islam: Their Contacts and Cultures down the Centuries* (Harper, 1937). Volumes V and VI of the learned series, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, by L. Thorndike, have now appeared (Macmillan, 1941), bringing this informing study through the sixteenth century. E. Gilson's numerous contributions to the history of mediæval thought now include *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages* (Scribner, 1938), an exposition of the way in which the scholastics sought to maintain doctrinal positions by rational arguments, and a study of wider range, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (Scribner, 1937). A. O. Lovejoy in *The Great Chain of Being* (Harvard University Press, 1936) brilliantly follows the Platonist strain in the philosophy and scientific thought of the early modern era. R. W. and A. J. Carlyle have completed their impressive series, *A History of Political Theory in the West* (Volume VI, London: Blackwood, 1936). Basil Willey's *The Eighteenth Century Background: Studies in the Idea of Nature . . .* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1940) forms, with that author's earlier parallel work on the seventeenth century, an excellent introduction to leading aspects of modern thought. The distinguished philosopher and historian, Benedetto Croce, in *History as the Story of Liberty* (translated by S. Sprigge, New York: Norton, 1941) has provided a thoughtful interpretation of Western history in the spirit of undismayed liberalism. The volume of studies presented to S. J. Case by his students and colleagues, *Environmental Factors in Christian History* (University of Chicago Press, 1939) edited by J. T. McNeill, M. Spinka, and H. R. Willoughby, treats numerous topics of interest to the worker in mediæval and modern church history.

The pen of the veteran mediævalist G. G. Coulton has been profitably busy. His *Medieval Panorama* (Cambridge University Press, 1938) vividly portrays English mediæval life. The second edition of his *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation* (Cambridge University Press, 1938), a fascinating collection of source materials in translation, forms a companion volume. In *Inquisition and Liberty* (London: Heinemann, 1938) Coulton has presented a fresh discussion of repression in the Middle Ages. Volume III, *Getting and Spending,* on the economic and financial history of monasticism, has been added to his important series *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge University Press, 1936). Other works of distinction on monastic history are: the collection of papers by W. Williams, *Monastic Studies* (Manchester University Press, 1938); D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England . . . 993-1216* (Cambridge University Press, 1940), a work of importance by a Benedictine scholar; and G. Baskerville, *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries* (Yale University Press, 1937) which goes far to disprove the alleged sufferings of the monks under Henry VIII. J. R. H. Moorman in *The Sources for the Life of St. Francis* (Manchester University Press, 1940) has presented the results of modern historical labor on the early Franciscan documents.

J. A. Duke has written an admirable *History of the Church of Scotland to the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1937). H. M. Smith's *Pre-Reformation England* (London: Macmillan, 1938) treats the late Middle Ages from an Anglo-Catholic viewpoint. M. Spinka has distinguished the teachings of Hus from those of Wyclif in *John Hus and Czech Reform* (University of Chicago Press, 1940). J. S. Thomson in *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste; Bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253* (Macmillan, 1940) aims to establish a canon of Grosseteste's genuine writings. Of the numerous books on Thomas More we may mention the volume by R. W. Chambers, *Thomas More* (London: Harcourt, Brace, 1935).

Recent numbers of the series of source translations, *Records of Civilization* (Columbia University Press), include I. W. Raymond's *Seven Books against the Pagans: The Apology of Paulus Orosius* (1936), *Medieval Handbooks of Penance* (1938), a translation of the "Penitential Books," by J. T. McNeill and H. M. Gamer, and E. Emerton's (posthumous) edition of *The Correspondence of Bishop Boniface* (1940). For the sixteenth century this series has R. H. Bainton's *Concerning Heretics . . . attributed to Sebastian Castellio* (1935) and L. K. Born's *The Education of a Christian Prince by Desiderius Erasmus* (1936). As an example of numerous competent monographs published by the Columbia Press we may mention *Discussion of Holidays in the Later*

Middle Ages by Edith C. Rodgers (1940), and R. W. Emery's *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne* (1941).

Historical books on the relation of Christianity to society and politics are fairly abundant. F. M. Hnik, a Czech scholar who has felt the influence of Troeltsch and of American liberalism, has written *The Philanthropic Motive in Christianity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1938). J. T. McNeill's *Christian Hope for World Society* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937) surveys the literature of Christian social thought from the post-apostolic age. F. Gavin's *Seven Centuries of the Problem of Church and State* (Princeton University Press, 1938) treats materials from Hildebrand to this century, with some reference to earlier Christian times. A. Fanfani's *Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935) is a translation of a valuable work by an Italian scholar. Fanfani's view of the origins of capitalism is in marked contrast with that of Weber, which long carried great weight. Anti-Weber also is A. Hyma's *Christianity, Capitalism and Communism* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: the Author, 1937), written in sympathy with Calvinism. Hyma has also presented *Christianity and Politics: A History of the Principal Struggles of Church and State* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1938). Much information is contained in E. D. Bebb's *Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life* (London: Epworth Press, 1935), and in Olive M. Griffiths' *Religion and Learning: A Study of English Presbyterian Thought . . .* (Cambridge University Press, 1935) which treats the history of education among the Nonconformists from 1662 to the rise of Unitarianism.

Civitas Dei is the title of a work in three volumes by L. Curtis (London: Macmillan, 1934-37) which is at once a revival of political Augustinianism and an anticipation in theory of Streit's *Union Now.* E. H. Hudson and M. B. Reckitt in a two-volume work entitled *The Church and the World* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1938-40) have assembled scholarly interpretations of the history of Christian sociology. A. S. P. Woodhouse in *Puritanism and Liberty, Being the Army Debates 1647-49, From the Clarke Papers* (London: Dent, 1938) offers revealing materials on the political ideas of religious men. Very informing, too, is *Theocracy and Toleration: A Study of the Disputes of the Dutch Calvinists from 1600 to 1660* (Cambridge University Press, 1938) by D. Nobbs. The four-volume series by W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Toleration in England* (Harvard University Press, 1937-41), is now complete (to 1660). This is a work of wide research and major importance. Part of its ground is covered in T. Lyon's *The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-39* (Cambridge University Press, 1937). T. S. K. Scott-Craig in *Christian Attitudes To War and Peace* (Scrib-

ner, 1938) reviews the teachings of Jesus, Augustine, Luther, and Grotius in relation to contemporary pacifism. The following special studies are selected for mention from a body of allied materials: A. Lincoln, *Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent, 1763-1800* (Cambridge University Press, 1938); M. Spinka, *Christianity Confronts Communism* (Harper, 1936); A. Frey, *Cross and Swastika: The Ordeal of the German Church,* translated by J. S. MacNab (Macmillan, 1938); A. S. Duncan-Jones, *The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Germany* (London: V. Gollanz, 1938); A. Keller, *Church and State on the European Continent* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937); W. Paton, *Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937); N. Ehrenström, *Christian Faith and the Modern State* (Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937), and W. Paton, *The Church and the New Order* (London: Student Christian Movement, 1941).

L. Elliott-Binns has given us a good account of the English Reformation, *The Reformation in England* (London: Duckworth, 1937), and F. M. Powicke has devoted to this topic a valuable section (pp. 353-488) in Volume IV of E. Eyre's *European Civilization: Its Origin and Development* (Oxford University Press, 1936), where it accompanies studies, chiefly by Roman Catholic authors, of other countries in the sixteenth century; this study has now appeared separately (Oxford University Press, 1941). Among other valuable books G. D. Henderson has written a scholarly series of studies entitled *Religious Life in Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Cambridge University Press, 1937) and *The Church of Scotland: A Short History* (Edinburgh: Church of Scotland Youth Committee, 1939), an authoritative popularization. Among books on British Reformation leaders we may refer to J. F. Mozley's *William Tyndale* (London: SPCK, 1937) and the same author's *John Foxe and His Book* (London: SPCK, 1940); C. Sturge's *Cuthbert Tunstal . . .* (London: Longmans, 1938); and Lord Eustace Percy's *John Knox* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937). Christina E. Garrett has brought into focus many of the personalities of early Puritanism in *The Marian Exiles* (Cambridge University Press, 1938).

The Reformation in Continental Europe has received relatively little attention from English writers in recent years. J. MacKinnon's *The Origins of the Reformation* (London: Longmans, 1939) contains a fresh review of church conditions in the late mediæval period. Dr. MacKinnon has also followed his earlier four volumes on Luther by *Calvin and the Reformation* (London: Longmans, 1936). R. W. Miles in *That Frenchman, John Calvin* (Revell, 1939) presents a simplified narrative of the Reformer's career, with well-chosen illustrative extracts from his writings; but the book is not written for scholars. H. Holborn's *Ulrich*

von Hutten and the Reformation (Yale University Press, 1937) and R. W. Winters' *Francis Lambert of Avignon* (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1938) are good examples of biographical work done with historical knowledge. E. C. Kiessling in *The Early Sermons of Luther in their Relation to the Pre-Reformation Sermon* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1935) has shown the revolution in preaching that attended the Reformation. J. P. Whitney's *History of the Reformation* (1907) has appeared in a new edition (London: SPCK, 1940); his *Reformation Essays* (London: SPCK, 1939) is a collection of old papers of considerable but uneven value. H. T. Kerr, Jr., in *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1939) has selected from Calvin's great work about one-tenth of its contents for convenient use. The numerous studies on Anabaptist groups may be represented by the revised edition of *The Story of the Mennonites* by C. H. Smith (Berne, Indiana: Mennonite Book Concern, 1941), a well-informed and fairly objective account of the Mennonites and related groups.

The history of Puritanism is involved in a number of the books already mentioned and treated directly in a few outstanding works of scholarship. These include M. M. Knappen's *Tudor Puritanism* (University of Chicago Press, 1938), which presents for the first time a proportional, objective, and sufficiently ample treatment of the origins and early development of Puritan groups. A book of different interests but of similar merit is *The Rise of Puritanism* (Columbia University Press, 1938) by W. Haller, most of whose material belongs to the seventeenth century. Both these authors have worked on many hitherto neglected sources. A notable addition to our knowledge of the field comes also from *Congregationalism in the Dutch Netherlands . . .* 1621-1635 (Chicago: American Society of Church History, 1940) by R. P. Stearns. This is the first in a series of prize essays to be awarded by the American Society of Church History. The second volume of W. C. Abbot's soundly edited *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (Harvard University Press, 1938-39) reaches the year 1653.

Among contributions to the history of worship we may select as of general interest W. D. Maxwell's *An Outline of Christian Worship* (Oxford University Press, 1936) and N. Micklem (editor), *Christian Worship: Studies in its History and Meaning* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936). The history of private and group piety is represented by a good number of books. R. M. Jones in *The Flowering of Mysticism: The Friends of God in the Fourteenth Century* (Macmillan, 1939) has brought to fresh notice an interesting mediæval group. The new attention given, especially by Dutch scholars, to the authorship of the *Imitatio*

Christi is represented by the translated work by J. Malaise, S. J., *The Following of Christ: The Spiritual Diary of Gerard Groote* (New York: America Press, 1937); while E. S. Klein has edited Richard Whitford's translation (*ca.* 1530) of this ever popular work, *The Imitation of Christ* (Harper, 1941).

C. M. Coffin in *John Donne and the New Philosophy* (Columbia University Press, 1937) has explained Donne's relation to rising scientific thought. B. Blackstone has edited *The Ferrar Papers* (Cambridge University Press, 1938). S. Hobhouse has continued his contributions to the understanding of William Law by his *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law* (London: Daniel, 1939). Paula Schaefer's *The Catholic Regeneration of the Church of England,* translated from the German (1933) by E. T. Scheffhauer (London: Williams and Norgate, 1935), offers a sympathetic evaluation of the results of the Oxford Movement. C. Smyth has gathered much important material into his history of preaching in England, *The Art of Preaching . . . 747-1939* (London: SPCK, 1940).

The literature on John Wesley and early Methodism has been greatly extended. Among the best of the later books are: G. C. Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Holt, 1935); U. Lee, *John Wesley and Modern Religion* (Cokesbury, 1936); F. J. McConnell, *John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1939), a brilliant and intimate study; Kathleen W. MacArthur, *The Economic Ethics of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1936); and J. R. Rattenbury, *The Conversion of the Wesleys: A Critical Study* (London: Epworth Press, 1938). J. W. Bready in *England Before and After Wesley* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938) has stressed the social change wrought by Wesleyanism. On the Church of England since Wesley we note C. Smyth's *Simeon and Church Order* (Cambridge University Press, 1941) on a distinguished Evangelical leader, and *The Church in the Victorian Era* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1936) by L. Elliott-Binns. For church conditions in nineteenth century France we may select *The Church in France, 1848-1907* (Macmillan, 1936) by C. S. Phillips, who had earlier treated this subject for the previous period (1789-1848). Leading movements in modern Roman Catholicism and its political relations are investigated in N. Abercrombie's excellent book, *The Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), in R. R. Palmer's *Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth Century France* (Princeton University Press, 1939), in C. C. Eckhardt's *The Papacy and World Affairs* (University of Chicago Press, 1937), an important work, in S. W. Halperin's *Separation of Church and State in Italian Thought from Cavour to Mussolini* (University of Chicago Press, 1937), and in

Sister Mary Goodwin's *The Papal Conflict with Josephinism* (Fordham University Press, 1938).

Some present issues have been acutely discussed by J. W. Nixon in *Protestantism's Hour of Decision* (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1940), and with valuable historical and thought emphasis in *Protestantism's Challenge: An Historical Study of the Survival Value of Protestantism* (Harper, 1939) by C. H. Moehlman. C. S. MacFarland's *Steps Toward a World Council* (Revell, 1938) affords a brief narrative of the ecumenical movement since the rise of modern missions. Of many books connected with this movement which contain discussions of historical data we may list *The Church of England and Reunion* (London: SPCK, 1938) by H. L. Goudge; *Union of Christendom* (Macmillan, 1938), edited by K. MacKenzie, and *Divided Christendom* by the French Dominican M. J. Congar, translated by M. A. Bonsfield (London: G. Bles, 1939).

From Off the Campus and On

Dr. Poteat needs no introduction to readers of the Crozer Quarterly. He is in such constant demand for addresses and sermons that it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that he is better known off the campus than on. Following fifteen years as a member of the faculty of the University of Shanghai, he was called in 1937 to Crozer as professor of homiletics and social ethics. "Can We Have the Fruits of Democracy without the Roots?" was the matriculation address at the formal opening of Crozer's seventy-fourth year, September 30, 1941.

It is a particular pleasure to welcome to our pages once again Dr. Newell. An earlier article, "Speaking of Challenges," which appeared in the January, 1941, issue, aroused wide interest. It is safe to say that the present paper will be equally influential. Clarity, simplicity, honesty, and common sense are characteristic of this truly great preacher. The editor hopes that his articles will continue to be regular items on our bill of fare.

In the last issue we published a clear-cut reply by Professor Max Otto, of Wisconsin, to an article by Dr. Brightman, of Boston University. In this issue Mr. Brightman adds a philosophical postscript. The questions, "What is Christianity?" and "What is a Christian?" would seem to be more debatable than might be inferred from some pulpit pronouncements. There is probably a moral in this.

Dr. Levy, the author of the thoughtful paper, "The Church Tomorrow," is "a Nova Scotian by birth and upbringing." He holds degrees in arts and theology from Acadia and a doctorate in theology from The United Theological College. He has held several pastorates in eastern Canada. At present he is the minister of the United Baptist Church in Hartland, New Brunswick.

Alban Gregory Widgery, since 1930, head of the department of philosophy at Duke University, is not entirely satisfied with some of the reviews of his most recent book, *Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life,* and has not hesitated to tell the world so. In this, the doughty Englishman has good historical precedent, as all who remember Byron's bellicose *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* will recall. Once again, readers of the Crozer Quarterly receive free ringside seats. Mr. Widgery holds degrees from Cambridge University, did graduate work in Germany and France, and was for six years professor of philosophy at the University of Bombay.

A professor of English in the College of Business Administration in Boston University, for several years an able and zealous broadcaster on the staff of Station WRUL in Boston, and a lay preacher in the Epis-

copal church, John Chilton Scammell is particularly fitted to talk to ministers about preaching and broadcasting. Readers will detect in this printed article the same racy and intimate style which makes his broadcasts so eagerly awaited. An Englishman by birth, educated at Harvard, it may be said of him, as it was of another: *Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto.*

Dr. Derwacter is not to be charged with intentional propaganda. Nonetheless his article is particularly timely, and he is well qualified to write it. For five years he was a missionary in Japan; since 1928 he has been a professor of Greek at William Jewell College. His able book, *Preparing the Way for Paul,* reveals him as a man who knows his way about in the first century, nor is this surprising in view of his academic pilgrimage—Denison, Newton, Harvard, and the University of Chicago.

There are few more useful tools for the student—and it is to be hoped that pastors consider themselves in that number—than occasional résumés, or reading lists, of recent books. It is the intention of the QUARTERLY to publish such from time to time in the several fields of theological thought. It is highly gratifying to initiate this series with one from the pen of John Thomas McNeill, himself an eminent and productive church historian. In 1927, after a broad scholastic training and several years of service on the faculties of two Canadian universities, he became a member of the department of church history at the University of Chicago. He is the author of several influential books in his chosen field.

As usual, the brunt of reviewing continues to fall on the faithful shoulders of members of the Crozer faculty. In addition, we have five reviews "from off the campus." Dean Weigle, for many years the executive head of the Yale Divinity School, is far too well-known in all theological circles to require introduction. We are particularly glad to welcome him again to our pages, this time as the reviewer of the recent book by Professor McNutt. Daniel Evans was for thirty years professor of theology at Andover and at Andover Newton; he is now retired and living in Belmont, Massachusetts. America has produced few more trenchant and incisive thinkers than James Bissett Pratt, long on the faculty of Williams College. It is to be hoped that this will not be his last appearance in these pages. Following more than twenty-five years in the pastorate, Mitchell Bronk joined the editorial staff of The American Baptist Publication Society, where he performed distinguished service until his retirement a year or so ago. Howard Wayne Smith, for many years pastor of the First Baptist Church at Ardmore, Pennsylvania, is a member of the board of trustees of Crozer Theological Seminary and an influential supporter of every forward-looking endeavor of the Baptist denomination. Both he and Dr. Bronk are alumni of Crozer.

BOOK REVIEWS

Worship in the Churches, by William Roy McNutt, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1941, pp. 275, $2.00.

Here is an admirable volume on the worship of God in the churches of congregational polity, with their inherited repulsion to the liturgical forms of sacerdotalism. Dr. McNutt writes from within the Baptist fellowship, but his message is for Congregationalists, Disciples, and even Quakers—for any Christian groups which stress the priesthood of all believers, freedom of conscience, and the liberty under God of the local congregation.

I do not mean that this is a controversial volume, thrashing out the old straw of the issues between Catholic and Protestant, and between liturgical and non-liturgical churches within the Protestant movement. It is just the opposite. It is constructive rather than controversial, irenic rather than polemical. Out of his long experience as a Baptist minister and as a teacher of young men preparing themselves for the Christian ministry, the author writes wisely and well of the meaning of worship and of how we may best seek the full experience of worship in the churches of free, democratic tradition.

The first five chapters deal with the nature of worship, which is rightly conceived, not as a mere celebration of human ideals, but as directed to God. The experience of worship is objective, not subjective merely. So, too, is prayer, which is part, though not the whole, of worship. Worship and prayer bring us into contact with reality, with the God who is the Father of all and the ultimate power with whom we have to do. The classic record of Isaiah's experience in the temple is followed as a clue which leads to the definition: "Christian worship (in the churches) is that varying and ascending series of experiences—emotionally charged, and sustained throughout by the appropriate attitudes—which arises in some awareness of God the Father of all men, moves forward through vision, sense of impotence, and reassurance, toward climax in dedication of life, thence descending through a feeling of peace, power, and conviction of social responsibility" (p. 29).

Chapters six to eleven may be described in broad terms as liturgical. Dr. McNutt is no foe of liturgy. He simply insists that it must be rightfully conceived. "Worship is the living, creative experience that liturgy sets in order, sustains, and displays. The *needs* of the rose led the gardener to build a trellis; the demands of worship call forth the order of service, or the liturgy. Aside from the growing rose, the trellis is useless and senseless; aside from the service it can render the actual worshiper the liturgy is a vain encumbrance to religion" (p. 107). There is a wealth of sound discussion of the language, the leadership, the "place," and the atmosphere of worship, the use of art as contributory to worship, and the meaning for worship of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper.

The last third of the book deals with worship in the setting of the total life of the church and the community. Chapter XII answers the inevitable question, "What would you do in the small church?" There follow discussions of the relation of worship to preaching, to social action, to health, to the Christian year, and to the expanding horizons of national and international life. There are some excellent illustrations of church interiors with adequate provision for worship, and several drawings of architectural plans. The selected bibliography is the least satisfactory part of the book, partly because of omissions, and partly because the practice of

labelling books as "o.p." (out of print) may be misleading. More than half of the titles in Section B of the bibliography are so marked. "Out of print" is not a permanent category; new printings are always possible. But this is only a slight defect in a really excellent book.

LUTHER A. WEIGLE

Introduction to the Old Testament, by Robert H. Pfeiffer, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xiii, 917, $4.00.

Here is a student's compendium of the literature of the Old Testament. Written in a familiar style, reminiscent of the classroom, without undue repetition, with few detours into bypaths, it is interesting yet succinct. Part I is introductory and deals with questions of general interest (pp. 3-126). Admirable discussions of the religious, literary, historical, and critical interests in the Old Testament are followed by brief but competent summaries of the history of the canon, texts, and versions of the Old Testament. The order of the chapters—religious, literary, historical, critical—seems to be a symptom of the author's personal emphasis. Religion stands in the forefront not only here but throughout the volume. But if so, in no place are hostages given to accuracy. Critical scholarship is the corner stone beneath the whole superstructure.

Part II is devoted to the Pentateuch (pp. 129-289). Here, in agreement with all modern scholars, the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, J, E, D, P, is accepted as basic. However, in the well-known moot point of the component elements in the J document the author makes his own critical contribution. The diverse elements in this document have long been recognized. Especially is this true in the parts found in Gen. 2:4a—11:32. Some have attempted the solution by positing a J^1, J^2, J^3, while Eissfeldt has suggested a primitive document, collated by a layman, symbolized by L. Pfeiffer, some ten years ago, segrated a body of this literature that had common characteristics which indicated that it might have originated in South Judah, or Seir, and was strongly tinged with Edomitic interest. This he designates by the symbol S (pp. 159-167; cf. *ZAW* [1930], p. 150). This interpretation meets the facts better than that of Eissfeldt, and is at least as satisfactory as that of Hempel. It is self-evident that at least some of this material was incorporated into J without having been reworked (cf. Gen. 6:1-4). That there is an Edomite flavor in some of it is also beyond dispute. That it all came from any single area might be difficult to prove. But the problem and the various solutions have been briefly and clearly stated, and the student cannot fail to appreciate the difficulties whatever solution he may accept. With like clarity and brevity, the documents, the law codes, the poems, and the redactors of the Pentateuch, with the critical evaluation of history and the theories are discussed (pp. 168-289). Then, following the divisions and the order of the books as found in the Hebrew Bible come the Former Prophets (pp. 293-412), the Latter Prophets (pp. 415-615), the Writings (pp. 619-838), while pp. 841-917 present abbreviations, a selected bibliography, and indexes of authors, scripture passages, and subjects.

Naturally, as stated in the foreword, the volume is merely a brief summary of a vast field of research (p. vi), but it is over nine hundred pages of competent research, the most complete, and most trustworthy introduction to the literature of the Old Testament to date. Most, if not all, of the important contributions to the study of the Old Testament have been fairly stated, while unimportant theories have occupied little or no space. In general, the conclusions have been those of orthodox modern scholarship, and while the author usually refrains from anything radical, his personal judgments are never suppressed.

On the whole, the impression grows that the author is not overeager to accept the newer hypotheses. He must be shown, pushed over, in fact, by the evidence. Probably it is not only because he follows the Hebrew divisions of the Bible that he uses *Pentateuch* rather than the more accurate term *Hexateuch.* He still uses *Jehovah,* indeed it belongs to the rhythm of his English, rather than the more correct *Yahweh.* The traditional dating of Habbakuk, 605-600 B.C., is preferred to 331, though the arguments for the latter are weighty (p. 599). Hosea surely could not have married a temple votary, but by giving symbolic names to his children he denounced religious apostasy. Chapter 3 could have nothing to do with Hosea's family life, and the figure of marriage can in no way be related to the fertility cult (p. 569). Amos, in spite of Morgenstern, is still a series of oracles, "two years before the earthquake" is a quaint editorial note, and the prophecy is no more closely dated than between 760 and 744 (pp. 577f.). Chapters 30 and 31 of Jeremiah were dictated by the prophet himself though the authenticity of 31:31-34 may not be certain (pp. 501, 503, 504). Despite the giants who in recent years have vigorously asserted a preëxilic date for considerable temple ritual and the probable use of certain Psalms therein, Pfeiffer insists that none, with the possible exception of Psalm 24:7-10, can possibly be preëxilic. He will have none of Mowinckel's suggestion that after David's reign the Judeans adopted a Canaanitic New Year festival, in which the enthronement of Jehovah was celebrated in the temple by singing such hymns as Psalms 47, 93, 96-99 (pp. 632-633). And in the interpretation of Ezekiel everything, including dates (save the apocalypse in 38:1—39:24, 25-29), stands as it did in orthodox circles forty years ago, while chapters 40-48 are considered the most influential legacy of the prophet (p. 554). But this conservatism is never due to lack of information; it is the deliberate and considered conclusion of the writer.

It is true, as in the case of Ezra, that facts have in some cases compelled the author to take up the newer positions. Ezra now seems but the vague figure of a legendary, pious Jew whom the Chronicler uses to accredit his program. Thus even his historical reality is far from certain (pp. 813-838).

While leaning towards orthodoxy, Pfeiffer has at the same time the spirit of adventure. He is ready to strike out new paths or to develop those long discarded by the students, if evidence is at hand. His S document of the Pentateuch finds a close friend in the book of Job. This matchless poem, chapters 28, 38, and 39 included, only excising the speeches of Elihu, is considered to be definitely Edomite. It was written about 600 B.C. and has greatly influenced Deutero-Isaiah and the later literature. This thesis is supported in detail (pp. 467-476).

So here it is, a treasury of scholarship, interpretations new and old, evaluated and presented in fine literary form by a competent student of the Old Testament, whose scholarship is never dry, and whose criticism is always fundamentally religious.

I. G. MATTHEWS

Christian Doctrine, by J. S. Whale, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 197, $2.00.

This volume contains the lectures, somewhat enlarged, delivered to the students of all the faculties of Cambridge University. It speaks well for the students that they remained the whole course, six hundred strong, and that they urged Dr. Whale to publish them. It also speaks well for Dr. Whale that he held the attention of the students and did not speak down to them but respected their intelligence and learning, and that he quoted when necessary from Latin, Greek, and German original sources, and kept the presentation of his thought on a high level.

He begins with the idea of the living God, restates the arguments for the existence of God, though he does not regard them as proofs, allows reason its place, but finds only revelation and the mind's response an adequate knowledge of God. Stress is laid on God's transcendence.

Then comes a presentation of the idea of man and his sin. He maintains that since man is made in the image of God he cannot be understood apart from God, and that however great his sin, that image is indestructible. Man's sin is his pride, his self-sufficiency, and all that he is and does is infested by his sinfulness. This emphasis is somewhat exaggerated, and he is found in the company of Barth, Bruner, Niebuhr, *et al.*

There follows an interesting and informing lecture on the Christian doctrine of history. He points out the difference between Greek and Hebraic-Christian conceptions of history, stresses the action of God in historical events and the movements of history and its convergence and culmination in Christ in whom the kingdom of God is established and from whom new forces are released. The kingdom is and is to be. In his discussion of the atonement the main emphasis is on what God does in and through Christ and not to him. There is no penal punishment, but there is profound vicarious suffering on the part of Christ, the second person of the God, who goes to the cross.

The treatment of the passion of Christ runs more along traditional lines and does not get beyond the creeds. Here the students walked over arid land or probably were left far behind.

In his conception of the church he is a Calvinistic High-Churchman. He does not, however, as some amongst us, overlook nor neglect nor depreciate the intimate personal character of the Christian life. "We meet God individually and we meet him alone." He realizes, however, that there is no isolated individual. Every man is in corporate relations in his whole life, and assuredly so, in his Christian life. He is a member of the body of Christ, and through the sacraments of the church the grace of God in Christ is mediated in him.

There is a striking lecture on death and the age to come. Death, he remarks, is the one certain thing. It is the supremely tragic, *i.e.,* irresolvable, inexplicable contradiction or tension in human life. It compels men to choose between despair and faith. Life in Hebraic-Christian thought is inevitably eschatalogical. It seeks to make sense of death. Only in the age to come, only in the eternal order, does life find its full meaning and is death understood. There follows in consequence an otherworldliness, which may be needed in certain quarters where the attention is fixed on the world, but there is grave danger that the values and causes of this earthly historical life be not as highly and intrinsically regarded as they should be.

While Dr. Whale is conservative in temper and viewpoint, he recognizes that the traditional language of our liturgics and the formulation of the creed are antiquated, and give modern folk considerable trouble, but he does not, except in the philosophical sections, speak in modern terms, and thus he fails to help such persons. It would be well to be on guard against the word "mere" in a derogatory sense: "mere idealism," "mere association." There is an error on p. 164. The antithesis to *subjectivism* is *objectivism.* He misquotes Whitehead, substituting *solitude* for *solitariness.* The reference to George Eliot's poem, "Oh, May I Join the Choir Invisible," as not a prayer to God but to herself is, to say the least, not in good taste, nor true. It was an aspiration.

One reads this volume, well written, in compact form, ably reasoned, thinking at times in the terms of modern thought, but moving largely in the traditional

orthodox, scriptural thought-world. It is largely biblical theology, not systematic or dogmatic theology. A correct biblical exegesis of a passage may not yield a valid truth. The critical question is, not whether it is scriptural, but whether it is true. Theology in our day is confronted with this question. Dr. Whale at times realizes this and raises many questions which he does not answer. He comes to a problem and tells us it is inexplicable, a mystery. Many theological mysteries are due to unexamined premises, uncriticized assumptions.

DANIEL EVANS

The Psychology of Christian Personality, by Ernest N. Ligon, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. xii, 393, $3.00.

This book might be described as a series of sermons upon texts drawn from the words of Jesus and expounded in the light of modern psychology. Dr. Ligon is well equipped for such preaching. He holds the degrees of bachelor of divinity from Yale Divinity School, and doctor of philosophy (with the major in psychology) from Yale Graduate School. He teaches psychology in Union College and has given especial attention to religious education. Clergymen, Sunday school superintendents and teachers, as well as many parents, might be able to get from his book excellent material for sermons and helpful guidance in their work with children.

More specifically, Dr. Ligon has given us a running psychological commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, together with many psychological suggestions for its practical application. His psychology is sound, and so, in the main, is his biblical interpretation. The lessons he draws from his texts and psychological principles are richly illustrated with all sorts of modern cases; and even the reader who comes to the book quite innocent of psychology will have no difficulty in understanding every page.

The book possesses most of the qualities of modern psychology and pedagogy. It has a great deal to say about human drives and reactions, dissociations and integrations. It is quite up-to-date. To be sure, the wicked critic with a bit of Mephistopheles in him may raise the question whether the teacher or preacher who brings to his reading an average amount of horse sense would, on finishing its 381 solid pages, have learned much more than some long names for what he knew already. But the suggestion would hardly be fair either to Dr. Ligon or to psychology. Certainly there are things, especially about the bringing up of children, which even people with horse sense can profitably learn from psychologists, and some of these things will be found in Dr. Ligon's book. It may be that the reader will not find the book very exciting: at times he may even feel a little bored. But there is no royal road to learning.

JAMES B. PRATT

Man of God, by David E. Adams, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. 210, $2.00.

Here is a real book. Its discovery is almost enough to encourage a bored and jaded reviewer to continue in a task which, *pace* Koheleth, is far more of a weariness to the flesh than is much study. Many books are cascading off the presses at the expense of trees which might well have been reserved for lumber or fuel; this is not one of them. It is one of those rare books which needed to be written; for which there is a definite place.

In the Old Testament is clear evidence of the emergence of what may be called a definite "man of God" pattern—with certain clear and well-marked char-

acteristics—in the stories of such earlier heroes as Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, and of a distinctly different pattern in the case of the preaching prophets of the eighth century and after. These almost stereotyped forms had come to serve as moulds for later figures of prominence; that is, there were definite things expected of a prophet, a Messiah, an apostle: he must be shown to have had certain unique powers, *viz.,* must have received a definite and special revelation, must have been set apart for a specific mission, must have had power to heal diseases and to perform other miracles of nature. Thus it is folly to blink this fact when we view the resulting portraits of Jesus in the gospels. What we see is the work of writers seeking to portray the figure of Jesus in the light of their own theories about him—not what he did and said, but what his chroniclers thought he must have done and said. When, for example, we read the tale in which Jesus is said to have cast out demons, we must ask: Was this what Jesus thought was happening, what his disciples thought had happened, or is this the way the story came to be passed on to the later writers?

This little volume falls thus into three succinct and natural divisions: first, a brief but rewarding survey of the several types of Old Testament thinking with their resulting clearly defined pattern-portraits; second, the core of the book, in which the gospel material is taken up *seriatim* (in the order adopted by Burton and Goodspeed in their convenient *Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels*) and analyzed to show the presence and consequences of this pattern material and of developing notions and a growing Christology; third, a brief survey of what remains in the light of the preceding analysis and sifting.

Some will see in the book a blend of Strauss and Paulus—Old Testament parallels and a rational interpretation of miracles—and they will unfortunately fail to see that there is far more. The book is not intended for those whose minds are closed, nor is it intended, I fancy, primarily for the professional student, although, if he be like me, the latter will read it with intense interest and will find a few hints tossed in his direction quite worthy of his attention; there is, however, I believe, a real reading public for such a book. If I know students (both college and seminary), and I think I do, they will read it with avidity; the frankness and the freedom from both pussyfooting and the attempt to kid the readers into believing that he is doing something that he is not doing (or is not doing something that he is doing!) can scarcely fail to commend it to those trained to appreciate evidence rather than platitudes. There is furthermore no dearth of genuine religion evident, but—another blessing—without obtrusion.

For those who accept Mr. Adams' contention—and I for one, although naturally I would prefer to state some points a bit differently, find it essentially sound—there may be, probably will be, losses, but principally in the realm of uncritically but tenaciously held beliefs. There can scarcely help being far greater gains. The student who for the first time views the moon through a telescope sees in sober literalness a new world opening before him. Does he regret the loss of views he may have thought he once held as a child, *viz.,* that the moon is made of green cheese? (Generally in astronomy, no; too often in religion, yes.) Is not a sense of reality and poise which can only come as one leaves his nursery or his fool's paradise worth something?

Furthermore, I greatly appreciate the emphasis so unobtrusively evident through the whole book that though the author's is essentially a critical approach he has not lost Jesus of Nazareth, instead has found him. I repeat, we need more books to sound that note. Liberal criticism has too long been on the defense; too long

we have been told that we simply tear up, that we have lost our religion as well as our Lord. Simply because we have felt it would be bad manners to tell our critics that when they say that they are liars, we have too frequently left the church to those who may have zeal but unfortunately have but little knowledge and who are content to insist that unless men have their kind of religion—often a religion of the lungs rather than of the head and heart—they have no real religion at all. Is it not about time to suggest that empty churches, the evident lack of interest on the part of so many educated men and women in what passes in many circles for religion, is due not to a dislike of religion *per se* nor to the devastating effects of higher criticism, but in no small part to an unthinking acquiescence to the claims of the noisy and ignorant to be the only spokesmen for God and to the consequent and easily understandable desire to have none of it? We need more books like this which will catch the attention and compel the respect of the sort of people whom the church is losing and whom it can least afford to lose if it is to continue to be the church.

Dr. Adams is a professor of the history and literature of religion at Mount Holyoke College; if his teaching is as fresh, as vigorous, as winsome, and as honest as his book—and it can scarcely fail to be—happy are the students of Mount Holyoke who elect his courses. If there were more teaching of this sort in college departments of religion, theological professors—at least in the biblical departments—might eventually be led to believe that "ministerial" students had not utterly wasted their time through electing college courses in religion.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Christianity in a Changing World, by Shirley Jackson Case, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. 204, $2.00.

As author of many standard works in the history of Christianity, Dr. Case has taught an ever enlarging and appreciative public to expect reliable, scientific results from his study and research. With the sincerity and impartiality of the true scientist he has sought facts, confidently believing that however they may disturb ancient traditions and beliefs they provide firmer ground upon which to establish a working faith for the guidance of humanity and the creation of the kingdom of God upon earth.

This present book is in reality an answer to the question whether that kingdom can be established. Can Christianity minister helpfully to this confused and battered world? That it has so served in times past there is no doubt. But this is not the world of a quarter century ago, let alone the world of twenty centuries ago. Has Christianity a message of hope for troubled humanity suffering the tremendous forces shattering the old foundations?

There are those who out of their pious faith and loyalty immediately answer in the affirmative. Has it not been the corrective, creative influence of the generations, whatever the changes? Christianity provides an *essence* which when accepted by men proves the power for saving personal and social values—a medicine not alone of immortality but of the nations as well. Others answer as vociferously in the negative. Does not the present hopeless state of mankind prove the impotence of Christianity in world affairs?

Dr. Case would give answer with the former group, but not for the same reasons. Christianity is not an essence, a static thing, an organization, institution, or body of doctrine. "In the last analysis Christianity is, always has been and always will be, a way of religious living in a complex and changing world. It ever remains

a quest rather than a finished attainment." Christianity is a process, ever a "becoming," a struggle in confident assurance of final victory of the human spirit over its world.

So by a factual review of history Dr. Case shows that Christianity cannot be defined in terms of *the* Church. There have always been churches, groups of believers who, according to the particular needs of their own time and place, have united in their faith in the enjoyment of salvation through Jesus Christ.

It has been likewise with dogma. The authoritative doctrines of the churches have changed in accord with new knowledge as well as in the effort to answer the new needs of men in the changing order of life. Nor can we say, "This and this alone is the gospel." The true preacher has always, necessarily, proclaimed his message of good news according to the requirements of his people. And those requirements have always been determined by their experiences of success or failure, security or insecurity, confidence or despair. Even personal piety, the way of life according to the will of God, has varied, all the way from asceticism and ceremonial to missionary activity and commitments of social service. "Let the Church be the Church" must not be a slogan seeking to restrain the churches within some traditional form of doctrine or mode of ministry; rather it must be a challenge to socialize religion.

This is a book that will not only inspire confidence but will also give birth to new impulses of dynamic, practical activity on the part of Christians.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Amos Studies (parts 1-3; Vol. I), by Julian Morgenstern, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1941, pp. xi, 428, $2.50.

A century and more ago the Hexateuch occupied the attention of Old Testament scholars, and with most rewarding, if almost revolutionary, results. But apart from studies in Isaiah little critical work has been attempted in the prophets until recent years. Now there is evidence of increasing activity in the study of these pioneers in social and ethical reform. This volume, a series of three essays, first published respectively in 1936, 1938, and 1940, presents a thoroughgoing critical background for the prophet Amos, and prepares the way for later volumes in which we are promised a reconstructed text in full and an adequate treatment of secondary material.

Dr. Morgenstern holds that Amos, a shepherd from Tekoa, was fully convinced that he had seen Yahweh in a series of visions, and had thereby been commissioned to denounce the sins of Israel. These visions were personal, supernormal, growing in intensity, and came at increasingly short intervals. The first one, that of the locusts (Amos 7:1-3; reconstructed on pp. 66, 67), came to Amos in the spring (pp. 69, 87), either that of 760 or (preferably) 749 B.C. (pp. 124, 250-303). The second vision, the consuming fire (7:4-6), came a few months later (pp. 69, 87), while the third, in part probably preserved in 8:2, the basket of summer fruit, came three or four weeks later, and then probably within two weeks, at the beginning of the autumn religious festival, came the fourth, the plumb line (7:8, 9; pp. 80-86). Thus, convinced that he had a divine vision, he went to Bethel where the eight-day festival was being celebrated, and on the last day, New Year's Day, he delivered his message of doom to Israel (pp. 87-88). This (with considerable secondary material) is now found in 1:3—6:14 (pp. 7-13).

The thesis of the author is that the prophet, like Elijah on Carmel and Jeremiah in his temple address, preached only one sermon, which required not more

than twenty or thirty minutes to deliver (pp. vii, viii, 8-11). Rebuked by Amaziah (7:10-13), he fiercely denounced the priest (7:14-17), and then in the act of turning away from the great sanctuary there came to him the fifth and last vision, the destruction of the altar, now found, in part, in 9:1; 3:14b, 15 (pp. 91-105).

Two years later, possibly to the very day, there occurred the great earthquake, referred to in 1:1 and Zech. 14:4, 5. Josephus has preserved the tradition that this was due to Uzziah's sin when he entered the temple, assuming the prerogatives of the Aaronic priests, and the Chronicler assures us that this presumptuous act was the cause of the king's leprosy (II Chron. 26:16). Morgenstern after a critical survey of these traditions is convinced of their probable accuracy.

Not only was the earthquake disastrous, but it proved to Amos, if he needed proof, that his message was from Yahweh; thus, following the destruction, when people began to settle down to their old ways of life, he was roused to write down, or more probably to dictate, the story of his call (7:10-15; 3:3-8; 7:16) and the contents of his message (pp. 107-110).

The strongly supported thesis is that Amos, like the other great prophets, was a psychic personality, subject to hallucinations, and that his visions, two of them especially, were not ordinary phenomena (pp. 61, 88). Thus, in direct opposition to the admirable work of Weiser in *Die Prophetie der Amos,* he insists that all the basic elements of the message of Amos were communicated to him (pp. 61, 90). In this, it is claimed, Amos actually represents a new and higher type of revelation in which the messenger beholds Yahweh in person and speaks with him mouth to mouth, as is assured in Numb. 12:6-8 (pp. 55, 65, 88). Yet the author has his moment of caution when he writes that "Amos actually experienced these visions, *if not objectively,* then *subjectively,* psychically, but in either case with the same reality for himself and with equally absolute conviction" (p. 89—italics ours).

Morgenstern is a master of the field and is a meticulous workman. Knowledge of the times in which each prophet lived is essential to the understanding of each message. This will necessitate the reorganization of much of the material in each of the prophetic books, to present a chronological sequence. Parallel with this must go the reconstruction of the Hebrew text that it may be intelligible. As a corollary of the historical process the numerous scribal additions must be noted, organized, and evaluated. These are arduous tasks, but apart from them there is no salvation.

This study makes notable advances on all its predecessors. Yet it is quite within the range of possibility that in some cases the fine superstructure is overweighty for the foundations. The author wisely warns us in the opening pages that contrary to theological tradition the verbal memory of primitive peoples is peculiarly inaccurate. Even in the first generation there is no certainty as to the original form even of a great poem (pp. 3-6). This being true, it is possible that some of the absolutes in these studies may prove to be untenable assumptions. The theory of one address appeals to us, but then it must, even on the most drastic revision, have been longer than that of Elijah or of Jeremiah. The unwavering conviction of Amos that he was called of Yahweh is assured, but where is the need to assume abnormality? The exact dating of the mission is indeed intriguing, but what if the Chronicler, Josephus, and Morgenstern had each his theological bias? However, this is a stimulating piece of work, worthy of the president of Hebrew Union College, and we eagerly await the following studies.

I. G. MATTHEWS

Philosophical Foundations of Faith, by Marion John Bradshaw, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. x, 254, $2.50.

In this series of the Hazen Lectures, delivered at the Middlebury Convocation of Congregational Ministers, Professor Bradshaw attempts to answer the question, "What does it mean to be a Christian?" His unique approach to this frequent interrogation lies in the fact that he tries to find an answer by going to the six founders of modern philosophy: Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Pascal, Spinoza, and Leibniz. Through an investigation of the religious philosophy of these six bachelor philosophers, none of whom, interestingly enough, ever became a professor, he seeks to determine their attitudes toward Christianity, hoping thereby to answer the question of the Hazen Lectures.

Even though Professor Bradshaw discovered that the founders of modern philosophy held different views on many subjects, he contends that their disagreements are not as complete as the unwary reader suspects. All of them, for instance, agree in their refusal to premise a double truth, one for religion and one for philosophy and the other fields of intellectual endeavor. All of them also recognize some connection between their basic philosophical views and their religious positions. However, each gives expression to a view of Christ. While these views are seldom the same, these men realized the necessity of giving the major religious personality of history a place in their thought. To cite the view of but one of the six—Thomas Hobbes—"and I profess still, that whatsoever the Church of England . . . shall forbid me to say in matter of faith, I shall abstain from saying it, excepting this point, *that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, died for my sins.*" Yet another element common to all these thinkers was that each reached his religious position rationally, insisting, at the same time, that it be intelligibly related to his own system of thought. Throughout his lectures, for example, Professor Bradshaw refers to the attitude of these men toward revelation. And just as many times he reveals, through their quoted words, their refusal to have anything to do with a revelation divorced from, or contrary to, the rational element in man. Such are some of the common attitudes of these founders of modern philosophy.

Personally, I do not feel that the basic interest of the Hazen Lectures is satisfied by Professor Bradshaw's treatment. If this book were presented to a non-Christian in the Orient or to an unbeliever in America as a guide to what it means to be a Christian, I fear no clear impression would be left on the mind of the reader. Admirable as the lectures are as a presentation of the religious philosophy of these seventeenth century thinkers, they do not make us sure as to just what a Christian is. Rays of light are thrown on certain aspects of this basic matter, but the whole does not "stand out in sunny outline, bright and clear," when the last page of the book has been read. Despite this fundamental deficiency, the book embodies a number of insights of rare value, such as this passage from Leibniz which is certainly deserving of frequent repetition, Professor Bradshaw himself quoting it twice:

> Well for men to talk of the love of God; but I see, by the effects, that few men truly have it, even those who are plunged deepest into mysticism. The touchstone of the love of God is that Saint John has given, and one who has a veritable ardor for the general good . . . is not far from the love of God.

One further word of commendation for this volume is in order. It is a much needed antidote for the view that we need be concerned only about the utilitarian

value of religion, but not about its ultimate truth. Through these founders of modern philosophical thought Professor Bradshaw makes it clear that religion has rootage not in man or custom alone, but also in the structure of the universe. That is to say, religion is true not because it works, but rather because it corresponds, when true, to the very nature of reality.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Paul Becomes a Literary Influence, by Albert E. Barnett, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. xiii, 277, $2.50.

This is one of those valuable studies for which there will unfortunately be a very restricted sale. This is not due to any lack in the book but to the linguistic deficiencies in the equipment of the average modern minister. Clerical enthusiasts for Paul who are without a competent knowledge of Greek will have to let it strictly alone. Nor is it a book to be picked up for a few moments of light diversion. Its values nonetheless for the literary critic of the literature of early Christianity are real, and professional students have reason to be grateful to Professor Barnett for having performed a very exacting task which must have consumed an immense amount of time and patience.

It is the working out and presentation of the evidence for the hypothesis which Professor Goodspeed announced some years ago and which he has not infrequently reiterated in his subsequent books, articles, and lectures: *viz.,* that after Paul's death he dropped out of sight until the author of Luke-Acts brought him back to Christian attention; that a reader of Luke-Acts, who also knew Colossians and Philemon, was prompted to gather such other letters of Paul as he might be able to discover by retracing Paul's steps with a copy of Luke-Acts under his arm as a sort of early Pauline *Bædeker;* that having collected all the letters he could find, he published them with an introductory letter of his own composition (our Ephesians), largely a mosaic of the letters it was intended to introduce and make more understandable; that the publication of this "edition" at once aroused great interest and led to a widespread literary activity in which Paul was headlined and which lasted a quarter of a century; that thereafter the Pauline *corpus* suffered a temporary eclipse, probably because of the enthusiastic use by heretical groups; that about the middle of the second century the letters regained once more their popularity. Goodspeed had urged that the writings of the last decade of the first and of the subsequent century evidence these changes of attitude.

To demonstrate this thesis—of great importance if true—Barnett examines systematically the following writings arranged chronologically and finds that they do fall into groups evidencing this changing attitude to Paul:

1. Ephesians;

2. Revelation, I Peter, Hebrews, I Clement, John, the Johannine epistles ("written as a corpus rather than as separate letters"), Ignatius, Polycarp;

3. James, Jude, Hermas, Barnabas, Didache, II Clement, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Aristides;

4. II Peter, Tatian, Justin Martyr, Melito, Athenagoras, the Pastorals.

His method is to cite in Greek the (consecutive) passages of each letter in turn which seem to him to evidence literary dependence (or definite familiarity) and the corresponding passage upon which in his judgment it is dependent; to discuss after each such block this evidence, and to indicate by the letters *A, B,* or *C* the

degree of probability; to add (in the case of each book) those cases which, while probable or possible, are less certain and do not warrant so exact a judgment as that implied by *A, B,* or *C;* and to tabulate after each book the evidence.

The book is well done and will be of permanent value quite irrespective of whether all the points of the initial hypothesis be eventually considered valid or not. Many of Barnett's incidental lexicographical observations are highly interesting (to the student of Greek). The planographic reproduction of the typewritten pages not only allows a lower price for a volume not destined to be a best seller but has prevented the intrusion of typographical errors which modern printers—even the best of them—make when setting what to them in very truth is "all Greek." The typing is almost universally impeccable.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Baptists: Their Message and Mission, by Hillyer H. Straton, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1941, pp. 179, $1.25.

Dr. Straton has presented us with another handbook on Baptist principles and polity. In brief, concise compass he has retold the familiar story of the origin of the people called Baptists, restated their doctrines, emphasized their contribution to religious and civil life, defined their organizations, and forecast their future.

It is decidedly encouraging to find him rejecting the pleasing but wholly imaginative and fallacious theory of Baptist "apostolic succession," which seeks to trace Baptist history back to the Jerusalem church if not to John the Baptist. Rightly, too, he states, though hesitatingly, that John Smyth, who in 1608 first "led . . . the Separatist group in the formation of a Baptist church," performed the rite of baptism by sprinkling or pouring not by immersion, which was not the accepted mode until 1640 or thereabout. Thoroughly baptistic is Dr. Straton when he declares: "Nothing could be farther from the truth" than "to believe that the total immersion of candidates for church membership must be one of our cardinal tenets." Baptists had their origin, as he says, not in questioning the mode of baptism but its meaning. Their "protest was against all sacramentarianism" and their primary insistence was "that we are saved by grace and not by works or religious observances."

The book, however, loses much of its value through the author's failure to maintain this detachment, an unpardonable sin in a historian. True, who shall escape condemnation! Generally fair in his treatment of controversial subjects and irenic of spirit, he yet reads too much of himself into his interpretations. The third chapter, "The Bible: The Source of Our Faith," is largely an expression of the author's views of the Bible, in fact an exegesis of scriptural passages, rather than a review of the historical position of the Baptists. For instance, the statement, "Baptists hold that all parts of the Bible are equally inspired," cannot be sustained. Many Baptists, accepting the author's own definition of that body, do not.

The same is true of the seventh chapter, "A Theology for Baptists." Admitting the Baptist principle of freedom of conscience the author nevertheless dogmatically lays down "the absolute essentials, apart from which Christianity cannot hope to live and fulfill its divine commission." These are his own judgments only.

Surely he cannot claim open-mindedness and freedom from personal bias when speaking of liberals he declares: "False intellectualism was a prevalent curse among this group," and "Pride of intellect, like any other pride, often goes before a fall. It is difficult for those who trust in any form of pride to enter into the Kingdom of God."

There the author forfeits all claim to be an honest, trustworthy historian and becomes a self-appointed critic of his fellow Baptists and Christians—with considerable of the Pharisee in his attitude. There is, in fact, too much of this moralizing throughout the book for it to be as valuable as it might have been. One has the feeling that the chapters are homilies written for the express purpose of instructing and inspiring certain groups of young students.

A few minor mistakes must also be pointed out. On p. 31 the year 1607 is given as the date for "the beginning of the English Baptist movement." On p. 60 it is 1604. The date generally agreed upon by historians is 1608. The arrival of Roger Williams in America is stated to be 1630. According to John Winthrop's *Journal* the date is February 5, 1631. Williams, the present author says, immersed himself, then "Holliman and eleven others." According to the sources all evidence is against the belief that Williams was immersed or practiced immersion. As Dr. Straton himself states, immersion had not by this time been adopted by the Baptists in England, and there is not the slightest authority for believing it had been in America. Without question, Mark Lucar introduced this mode later when he came from an immersionist church in England to the new land.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

What Mean These Stones? by Millar Burrows, New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941, pp. xvi, 306, $2.50.

This book is different. With a good grasp of the archæological material the angle of approach may rightly be termed biblical. Following the introduction is a chapter on text and language, in which the definite results of archæology are indicated in the interpretation of various texts long doubtful, or actually misunderstood (pp. 30-59). One illustration out of many will suffice. In Hosea 5:13, the translation *king Yareb* has long been questioned. It was unintelligible. Recently a letter to a king of Ugarit has the Canaanitish equivalent of the Assyrian term *great king,* and it is the same as that of our Hebrew text. So an old time conjecture that in place of *king Yareb* we should read *great king* is established (p. 40). Likewise in the closing chapter every page throws new light on some biblical custom or statement (pp. 250-292).

A chapter on general orientation indicates that to understand the literature of a people we must be familiar with the geography of their country, and know their customs, psychology, and history. In these areas archæology aids the biblical student in getting his feet on the ground (pp. 60-115). Two chapters deal with background —material and secular (pp. 116-197), religious and ethical (pp. 198-249). In these, a wealth of cogent material is marshaled in orderly array, and its relation to the interpretation of passages in the Old and New Testament is definitely indicated.

The author is familiar with the material at hand, both archæological and biblical. Well-informed on prevailing theories he has no axe to grind, unless it is the axe of research. To him probabilities are not proofs (p. 28). Always independent in judgment, where the evidence is not preponderating he is usually hesitant. To him many issues are not yet closed, for he is aware that new evidence from papyri, or potsherds, or from these stones may come to light tomorrow. Hence theories, no matter how ancient, must ever give way to facts. To understand the Bible is more important than to defend it (p. 6). We join the author in hoping that this volume will be of value to the many divergent groups interested in a better understanding of the Bible.

I. G. MATTHEWS

God's Back Pasture, by Arthur Wentworth Hewitt, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. xii, 144, $1.50.

Throw not this volume aside because it is a "Book of the Rural Parish," ye denominational department heads, city pastors, and seminary students with an eye single to the main chance! The author has a message for you as well as for the country pastor. The latter will find large help here, but you will get a jolt that will jar you out of a lot of your misconceptions about religious work in the "back woods" if you have nerve enough to take it. Dr. Hewitt is no novice in the field of rural work. This is his third volume dealing with its problems and opportunities, and these all reveal a life consecrated in thought, word, and deed to the interests of the far-flung and neglected rural population.

"What is wrong with the rural parish?" the writer asks. He answers by bidding us lift up our eyes and see; he points out the unhandy size of many parishes, the need of union among divided and competing churches, the failure to enlist auto and radio in the interests of the church, the distress following soil erosion and migrant population, the exodus from country to city, the evils of tenancy, the presence of rural slums, the absence of churches in many villages, and the large number of children as well as adults who receive no religious instruction.

"What is wrong with the rural church?" is his next question. He gives six definite answers. "It is the victim of *invincible ignorance,*" on the part of those whose "presuppositions are all urban"; "of *ecclesiastical manslaughter,*" by unintelligent officialdom; "of *fatalistic pessimism,*" through its own unconquerable lack of courage; "of *pious immorality,*" through evil speaking, carping criticism, and lack of a sense of business honor; of *"economic stringency,"* a more imaginary than real handicap; and of the fact that it is a *"colony, not a state,"* surrounded by extended areas unorganized and unevangelized.

Having thus fairly surveyed the field, the writer brings the wealth of his knowledge and experience to bear on the housing, economic, social, and organizational problems of the country church and its parish. A special section of the book is given to the educational problems of the rural pastor, including a chapter which answers in a practical way the question "How may the pastor become a good educator?"

Throughout the volume the reader is ever conscious of a haunting refrain, "My Heart's in the Highlands," which rises to crescendo in the chapter on "Rural Philosophy." Here the author beards the lion of urban pride in its den, and turns the arguments of city dwellers in favor of metropolitan pastorates against themselves to their confusion.

The book opens with a brief invocation called "Grace before Meat," and closes with a noble ascription of thanksgiving and praise entitled "The Prayer of the Rural Men." The pages between fulfill the blessing and justify the prayer.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

The Christian Criticism of Life, by Lynn Harold Hough, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941, pp. 312, $2.50.

Writing as a theistic and evangelical humanist, Dean Hough endeavors to point out the true meaning of humanism and to rescue it from the non-theistic associations with which it is customarily associated in our generation. His thesis is that humanism existed long before the term was coined in the Renaissance by men who began to talk about the humanities. In its basic meaning humanism implies man's

belief in his own humanity. It centres in the consciousness that men are of worth, that human values are significant, and that the human personality can be the carrier of a beauty, goodness, and truth which makes it an end in itself. Things are never to be equated in value with people. When they are, and when human beings are regarded as of secondary worth to things, then trouble lies ahead for both man and society. This is the tragedy of all totalitarianism. "The totalitarian state is erected upon the ruins of man's belief in his own humanity" (p. 34).

This concern for the person, and for his values and dignity, had its rise in the humanism of Greece, which centred in Socrates and Plato, the first philosophers to turn from "things to thought." Starting his pilgrimage at this point, Dean Hough rapidly introduces us to the humanism of Rome, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the modern world. In his analysis of the last period, he discusses the relation of humanism to science, the machine, and social change.

The heart of the book is found in chapters XI-XV wherein the three levels of existence are distinguished and discussed. These are: the subhuman, the human, the divine. Concerning these levels, which at first mention seem rather simple and commonplace, we are told that "the student who is too impatient to make an ever-renewed study of the doctrine of the three levels will never understand critical humanism. More than that, he will miss the real meaning of life" (p. 136). It is Dean Hough's contention that man, the intermediate entity in this scale of existence, can never be explained by that which is below him in the subhuman, but only by that which is above him in the divine. God, and not the beasts, is the key to the mystery of human life. Moreover, the values which are the highest for man can only be preserved as they are found to have ultimate rootage in the very structure of the universe. Interpreting this position in intellectual terms, Dean Hough comes to a conclusion which he stoutly defends, namely, that "humanism and theism belong together" (p. 204). Thus, by interpreting man finally in terms of that which lies above rather than below him, we must reach the conclusion that the human is a fit vehicle for the divine and reaches its full glory when the divine enters it. This consummation came fully in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. Here the two higher levels of existence, the human and the divine, became one. "It was only when the Son of God made human life His own that the possible life for men was at last made clear. The human was created with such subtle kinships with that above the human that only the Divine could reveal humanity to itself. You never understand man until you see Jesus Christ walking the earth" (p. 214).

The volume is also noteworthy in that it is a critically constructive defense of theism. Beginning, in true empirical fashion, with man, the author proceeds to ask what the self-conscious personality he finds therein must mean in relation to the higher or divine level of existence. Contending that we cannot explain the higher by the lower, he reaches the conclusion that "only free controlling intelligence, which is the highest and most potent thing one finds as one goes through existence on the [*sc.* first] two levels, and which exists only on the second level, can be used as a clue to determine the meaning and distinctive quality of the ultimate reality of the universe" (p. 193). The reviewer is in hearty agreement with this conclusion. He is of the opinion that the last half of Dr. Hough's book is one of the most stimulating contemporary defenses of theism. It should be referred widely to serious laymen and theological students.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Spinoza and Religion, by Elmer Ellsworth Powell, Boston, Chapman and Grimes, 2nd edition, 1941, pp. xii, 344, $2.50.

In this second edition of Professor Powell's study of the metaphysics and religious conceptions of Benedict Spinoza, we enjoy a timely revival of a book first published in 1906. Although earlier indications had come to Professor Powell that a second edition of this work was desired in certain quarters, he ignored them because his interest had shifted to the political and social problems created by the heretical economic views of Karl Marx. His change of mind in regard to this second edition was prompted by observations last winter in Miami. There he discovered many Jewish refugees who were profoundly interested in Spinoza. This resurgence of interest in the seventeenth century philosopher was confirmed by the presence of a lively Spinoza Club in Miami Beach. These conditions prompted this second edition.

In an interesting biographical sketch preceding the main discussion, Professor Powell discloses Spinoza's outward observance of religion through his frequent attendance at church services, a practice entirely at variance with his expressed view that all emancipated minds are above religion. This strange inconsistency between practice and expression sets the stage for the discussion which follows.

Few men have had their statements on religious matters more diversely interpreted than Spinoza. He has been spoken of as "the greatest atheist that ever lived" and also as one "full of religion . . . and full of the Holy Spirit." This same wide variation of interpretation has applied equally to his conception of God. Some have said his God must be regarded as personal; others as impersonal. These opposite judgments explain why one terms him the "God-intoxicated philosopher," while another speaks of him as an atheist. This diversity of evaluation makes it clear why "there still prevail . . . the vaguest possible notions in regard to Spinoza's relation to religion" (p. 63).

The relation of Spinoza to religion forms, of course, the core of the book. We are introduced to this after an excellent exposition of the formal and real attributes which Spinoza associated with *substance,* which he considered as the independently existent and unconditioned. This *substance* was identified in his thought with God. The formal attributes are stated to be self-existence, eternity, infinity, immutability, perfection, and cause. These, obviously, are purely metaphysical conceptions which are never associated by the Dutch philosopher with personal qualities in the Deity. Indeed, Spinoza will have nothing to do with personal qualities or attributes in his *substance* or God, which he persistently deprives of all purpose, volition, and knowledge. If the Infinite has thought, for instance, it is only in the sense that it is the "passive spectator of all that exists and happens outside itself," but which "in no way affects the rest of reality or is affected by it." The persistence of Spinoza in accepting such an impersonal and disinterested Absolute leads Professor Powell to characterize his system as "atheism." "So far from being the religious philosopher *par excellence,* which he is often supposed to be, he represents the diametrically opposite spirit and world-view" (p. 240).

Excellently written, keen in analysis, revealing painstaking investigation, this volume will be welcomed by all who desire enlightenment on the difficult problem of Spinoza's place in the religious thought of the ages. GEORGE W. DAVIS

Methodism and the Frontier, by Elizabeth K. Nottingham, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. viii, 231, $2.50.

The questions, "What is religion?" and "What do men seek through religion?" find abundant answer in this book, for its story is much more comprehensive than

the title would indicate. It is not merely the account of the rapid progress Methodism made on the frontier of America, but it also reveals how a certain type of Christianity was inevitably produced in that environment of loneliness, struggle, poverty, and desolation of the pioneer settlements.

People from good homes, from well established communities, inheritors of English and Colonial culture, were scattered upon the plains, throughout the valleys, and among the hills of the new, untamed, virgin lands of the west. Homes were barren of all comfort, lives were empty and depressed, yearning for expression and the joy of friendly, neighborly fellowship. When the ministers came to these primitive settlements and people gathered in religious assemblies, the fountains of the great deep were broken up, emotions knew no bounds, ecstasy swept the multitudes into the madness of joy.

Religion is the consciousness and confirmation of human worth, the expression of friendliness and good will, the triumph of man over all the destructive forces of desolation and want, of toil and tears. So, says the author, from the days of the earliest migrations westward with their loneliness of isolated homes, to that swift urban development with its still greater aching loneliness of the individual lost in the city mass, America has had her revivals, that form of Christianity which gives man an assurance of right relationship with God by reëstablishing him in wholesome, joyous fellowship with society.

Methodism was well prepared to perform this task on the frontier of the New World, because its chosen endeavor had always been to reinstate the wayward, the straying one, the prodigal, in the bonds of sacred fellowship with his group. Nowhere and at no time has there ever been a greater demand for that Christian effort than on the western plains of this land in its pioneer days of rapid advancement.

Here is an explanation of the marvelous success of this denomination in this country. It has always maintained a careful balance of centralization and individualism. The frontier bred freedom, but under urgent necessity it also bred coöperation, unity, and interdependence for the sake of existence and survival. The genius of Methodism lies in its recognition and organization of those two factors.

But there is another explanation of Methodist success which the author has neglected to state. Both the nation and the Methodist church wisely created and promoted an esprit de corps—the nation a patriotism and the church a loyalty—by developing in the citizens and members respectively a sense of pride in numbers and achievement.

Methodism and the Frontier is one of the most interesting and instructive books on the history of American Christianity which has appeared in many years. Readers will enjoy the many anecdotes concerning Peter Cartwright, Allen Wiley, and James B. Finley—and especially those which tell the story of the rivalries, not always of good report, carried on between the protagonists of the Methodists and Baptists.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

The Potsdam Führer, by Robert Ergang, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. 290, $3.00.

In this, the first biography in English of Frederick William I, father of Prussian militarism, we are again made cognizant of the forces which led to the formation of modern Germany, and which, in large part, account for her present role as disturber of the peace in European life. King of Prussia from 1713-40, Frederick William made the creation of a strong army the passion of his life.

Unlike his father, Frederick III, whose dominating passion was to imitate the luxury of the court of Louis XIV of France, and whose consequent extravagance left little for creating an effective armed force, Frederick William I was pitilessly economical to the point of penuriousness, even abusing his wife when she did not know the price of food served upon the royal table. He watched all the expenditures of the royal government. Year after year he reduced the salaries of officials throughout the realm and enforced the strictest of governmental economies, solely that he might have money to pour into his army. The result was that during his reign he created the fourth army in Europe in strength and the best in discipline and military precision. And this, despite the fact that Prussia was the tenth European state in territory and the twelfth in population.

Nothing was allowed to stand in the way of the creation of an effective army. For this purpose the militia was abolished because young men were joining that service in order to escape the regular army. Many were impressed into the military life against their will or when under the influence of strong drink. Royal agents ranged from one end of Europe to the other seeking large men for the famous regiment of giants. Some of these men were lured to Prussia by false and grandiose promises; others were actually kidnapped and carried across the border. Frederick William was so passionately eager for such recruits that he even justified scripturally the extreme methods used to secure them. Among the passages he employed to prove that God countenanced the kidnapping of tall men were: "He will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work" (I Sam. 8:6); "When Saul saw any strong man and valiant man, he took him unto him" (I Sam. 14:52). Truly, any rascal can justify his villainy by recourse to the Scriptures!

In a real sense, it may be said that Frederick William drew the first lines upon the Nazi blueprint. He was an effective dictator, regarding all insubordination as the unforgiveable sin. In the army regulations of 1726, he saw that it was stated: "When one takes the oath to the flag one renounces oneself and surrenders entirely, even one's life and all, to the monarch, in order to fulfill the Lord's will; and through this blind obedience one receives the grace and the confirmation of the title of soldier." Not only was such obedience required in the army; it was also mandatory in all government services. The king stated what he expected of his coworkers in a letter to Leopold of Dessau: "There must be subordination; that is the most important thing in the entire service." This held for all his subjects.

Another line in the Nazi blueprint drawn by Frederick William is found in the Fiscalate. This consisted of a corp of tried officials who assisted the king in keeping watch over their fellow officials. Their duty, as the king himself stated it, was to keep him informed as to "how everything is and who is an honorable man and who is untrustworthy." This service functioned openly through inspectors and secretly through unknown agents. In it we see the pattern for the modern *Gestapo*.

Yet another line which Frederick William drew for the Nazi blueprint lies in his treatment of the Jews, whom he tolerated in his territories only because he believed their commercial genius would sharpen any similar proclivities in his German subjects. Like earlier rulers of Prussia, he systematically plundered the Jews by collecting from them a protection tax, a birth tax, a death tax, a special marriage tax, taxes on synagogues and cemeteries, and special contributions upon occasion. He said to his son, Frederick the Great, "If you need money, levy the

sum of 20,000 or 30,000 taler upon the entire Jewry, and do that every three or four years, and this above the protection tax." In times of financial stringency, Frederick William compelled the Jews to buy large amounts of woolen cloth each year from the royal factory in Berlin. It was then up to them to market it as best they could. When times became better, however, the king became impatient with the Jews and, upon one occasion, when several Jews had participated in a robbery, was restrained only with the greatest difficulty from expelling them all from his territories.

This volume deserves wide reading, portraying as it does with such vividness the early, historic antecedents of Nazi ideology.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Faith and Nurture, by H. Shelton Smith, New York, Scribner, 1941, pp. xii, 208, $2.00.

Here is a challenging volume, and rightly the November selection of the Religious Book of the Month Club. The challenge is to religious liberalism, and the thesis set forth is that liberalism has gone so far as to have forsaken that which is essentially Christian. Christian education is the particular area under scrutiny.

Such doctrines as divine immanence, evolution, growth and progress, Christian nurture, the goodness of man, the historical Jesus, and scientific religion, though laden with great truth, have been pushed to extremes that are untenable. When these extremes of doctrine come to operate in the area of education the end—at least, from the Christian standpoint—is sterility. For instance, says the author, divine immanence in the natural order degenerates into the natural order only; the natural goodness of man is so positive that his goal is attainable by nurture in the graces of social living, God becoming extraneous; the historical Jesus comes to his own as the very good man, etc. The upshot of the whole matter is that the universe, religion, the kingdom of God, and democracy are all anthropocentric. Education built upon such a view has nothing whatever to characterize it as Christian.

The author is a clever and incisive thinker and has done a scholarly piece of work. He is not an "anti," but he does challenge the liberal on his own ground, at the same time granting his inestimable contribution—up to a point—to religion.

My criticism of *Faith and Nurture* is that it bases its whole study upon the work of the ultraliberals, men who are thoroughgoing humanists. But they do not speak for the rank and file of workers in the field of Christian education. For example, look at the seven objectives of Christian education set forth by Vieth, objectives which are all but generally accepted by the rank and file of us: the first of these has to do with God as central in religious experience, and the second with the understanding and appreciation of Jesus Christ as lord of life. And so on to the end, these objectives embody all the vital and essential truths of a living Christianity. Coe, Dewey, and their disciples are great and influential, but they are less dominant than Dr. Smith would have us believe.

W. R. McNUTT

BOOK NOTICES

Every Man's Book, by Francis Carr Stifler, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. 113, $1.00.

Those of us who had work with Professor Stifler in Crozer's New Testament classroom, back there in the eighteen nineties, do not wonder that both his sons are Bible men. The elder (class of 1899) has published a creditable study of Acts and the beginning church, and here is Francis, the younger son ("born on the campus"), engaging in a splendid crusade for the Bible and Bible reading. The father used to insist that while the Bible's languages are dead the book itself is the most alive thing in the world. This is the underlying thesis of the present volume. Accordingly, in chapters appropriately entitled "You Cannot Blackout the Stars" and "Freedom's Textbook," it pushes the Bible right into the troubled and darkened life of our time, stressing its solutions as the only ones adequate to the problems we face.

The eighteen comparatively short sections are largely based upon Dr. Stifler's widely-known radio talks, and like those talks are popular, genial, and hence delightful reading. As a secretary of the American Bible Society the author has had at his disposal quantities of pertinent illustrative material; facts about the making of the Bible; its tremendous influence in the unfolding of human history; its supreme part in missionary endeavor; its immense and ever increasing circulation; the high valuation that the great ones of the earth have placed upon it.

It goes without saying—at least for those who know Francis Stifler—that the book is entirely sane and free from banalities and sentimentalism. "My mother's Bible" and "the Bible she put in my hands when I came away from home" are left in the domestic holy of holies where they belong. Nor is the Bible of this book the one upon which certain religionists "stand with both feet," shouting for the plenary inspiration of even its jots and tittles; it is the *vade mecum* that the Christian should keep at his elbow, to read, study, and use. As for the man on the street, he notoriously does not know what a wonderful, worth-while treasure the Bible is. He should—and he will after reading these chapters. After all, the Bible *is* in sober truth *Every Man's Book.* Appropriately, the closing chapter is captioned "Falling in Love with the Bible."

MITCHELL BRONK

Newtopia, by P. W. Wilson, New York, Scribner, 1941, pp. 219, $2.00.

This is a worthwhile contribution to current thought. The author, born in England, sometime Member of Parliament and long the American correspondent for English newspapers, brings the realism of a trained journalist to his observations upon the present world scene. There is a clarity and spiciness in his language which makes reading him no chore at all.

In spite of the title, the book is not another dream of what may be nor is it a despairing tirade against what is. On the contrary, Mr. Wilson starts with a picture of the life that was before the present war obtruded itself into the area of civilized man's habitation. The obvious desire of the men of that time, the Newtopians, was to have roofs over their heads and room in which to follow their pursuits with freedom. The headache, caused by the outbreak of war, still bothers these men; but, when they peer into the future, they are looking for the same things, security and spaciousness enough for individual activity and growth.

The panaceas for days to come must be measured by this Newtopian yardstick. All the patterns proposed for future world orders are brought to this test of validity. Hence, the desiderata of a just and durable peace are rooted in the Newtopian idea that shelter (in the widest sense) and liberty under law must be insured in any order promising permanence. The author sees that freedom of the seas, freedom of access to raw materials, and freedom of trade across national frontiers are basic principles to be followed by those desiring to banish war and fix the foundations for the kind of world men want. Even those most casually concerned in the world's future welfare can afford to ponder this work of an informed and disciplined mind.

HOWARD WAYNE SMITH

The Church and the New Order, by William Paton, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 188, $1.50.

The author, the Reverend William Paton, has been an officer of the International Missionary Council for many years, and few men have enjoyed better opportunity for a study of the church the world around. In this volume he is writing with reference to the responsibility of the church as an ecumenical body, or "a universal society," in the new order that he is sure lies ahead, and the volume professes to present "the Christian answer to the problems of a victorious peace." Note: "A *victorious* peace"!

The book deals largely with the history of international relations in recent decades, and special interest is manifested in a better understanding between the British Commonwealth and the United States especially. The author frankly confesses certain convictions which probably affect his view of what the church can or cannot do in the new order. For instance, he does not doubt "that an Axis victory would mean for the church a life in the catacombs for generations to come." Then he raises a question as to the auspices under which the work of reconstruction in the new order might be carried out successfully. He thinks there is just one answer: The British Commonwealth and the United States working together with an identity of purpose and policy under the influence of certain common and essential ideals. Although he takes positions that some readers will feel weaken his argument, Dr. Paton states impressively the function of the church in creating a new order. "There is no other way of creating an international *ethos* than the preaching of the Gospel of God as Lord of the nations." "There can be no international *ethos* without a religious basis."

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

Fifty Fruitful Years, by P. E. Burroughs, Nashville, Broadman, 1941, pp. xiv, 333, $1.00.

In this book we have the story of the remarkable development of the work of the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, which, in the face of innumerable difficulties, grew in half a century, 1891 to 1941, from an infant institution, whose life was often in doubt, into the strongest organization controlled by the largest group of Baptists in the world.

At first the Board gave itself exclusively to the publication of a very small volume of Sunday school literature at a time when many of the Baptist churches in the South preferred to go outside their own territory for their supplies, and some of the leading men in the Southern Baptist Convention desired in this way to help perpetuate a fraternal connection with the Baptists of the North.

Not for six years did the Board venture to publish a real book. Now many books come from its presses. Four years later field work was taken in various

directions in the promotion of interest in Sunday school work. Then followed training courses for teachers, and an architectural department, for the benefit of churches desiring to improve their facilities for religious education. Soon the Board decided to set aside a part of its profits for aid to the Home and Foreign Mission Boards of the Southern Baptist Convention in their work, and to coöperate with state conventions in their plans. It inaugurated the Baptist Student Union and assumed responsibility for the conduct for the Ridgecrest Assembly, which now has become a centre where, throughout the summer months, numerous denominational gatherings are held for inspirational and educational purposes. In many ways the Board has been the handmaiden of the Southern Baptist Convention in the promotion of enterprises not strictly related to Sunday schools especially, but of large educational value.

There is brief reference in the volume to temporary friction with a Baptist organization in the North, which may have been due in part to sectional sensitiveness and to a failure on each side to understand the other's viewpoint.

All in all, it is a highly interesting story, especially to those who, like this reviewer, know some of the principals involved at the very beginning and later, and the different viewpoints which they represented.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

Living Under Tension, by Harry Emerson Fosdick, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xix, 253, $1.50.

The public has come to expect something of unusual value whenever a new book or collection of sermons by Harry Emerson Fosdick is announced. There will be no disappointment with reference to his latest volume, *Living Under Tension,* between the covers of which may be found twenty-five of the recent sermons by one of the most popular preachers of modern times.

The subject of the first sermon in the volume furnishes the title of the book, which is appropriate, since most of the sermons reproduced here were prepared and preached in the atmosphere of the days of stress and strain in which we are still living. However, Dr. Fosdick has preferred to deal with eternal principles rather than with temporary issues. Yet, he has not avoided current situations, and again and again he reaffirms briefly his well-known convictions regarding the futility of war, its evil consequences, and the impossibility of getting peace by unpeaceful methods, or democracy by undemocratic methods, or liberty by illiberal methods.

One could not even characterize each of the twenty-five sermons in an ordinary review. It is enough to say that they are up to Dr. Fosdick's recognized standard of excellence and will richly repay an unhurried reading, perhaps one at a time on Sunday afternoons. To this reviewer the following sermons were especially impressive: "How to Stand Up and Take It," "What Does the Divinity of Jesus Mean?" "The Cross, an Amazing Paradox," "A Great Year for Easter."

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

The Old Testament: A Liability or an Asset? by George Ricker Berry, Hamilton (N. Y.), Republican Press, 1941, pp. 107, $0.90.

The title of this little volume is the caption of the closing chapter. The answer to the question is: often in the past it has been a liability; rightly interpreted it is an asset. Theories such as verbal inspiration, infallibility, the equality of all its parts for ethics and religion, with the inevitable allegorical method of interpretation, have had disastrous results. But on the other hand, its crucial human experiences, the significant biographies, the work of the great prophets, the evident development of vital religious concepts, all these at all periods have been invaluable.

The early chapters, i-viii, present the gradual growth of great ideas such as the concept of God, the ideas of right and wrong, as they took form in the midst of national and international conflict. The book is easy reading, never encumbered by technicalities, touching the high points as viewed by one familiar with all the facts, who for years has been in the forefront of Semitic scholarship. It is good reading for one who knows the field, it is illuminating for the novice who wishes to know the basic facts.

I. G. MATTHEWS

And Great Shall Be Your Reward: The Origins of Christian Views of Salvation, by Paul S. Minear, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941, pp. vii, 74, $1.00.

This, as the subtitle indicates, is a painstaking and thorough investigation of Christian views of reward; it was undertaken, in part, as a "clarification of the modern confusion of tongues," in (larger) part, it may be inferred, to obtain the degree of doctor of philosophy from Yale University. In the latter respect, at least, it was eminently successful. Professor Minear treats his subject under five heads: rewards in Judaism, salvation in hellenistic culture, Jewish efforts at syncretism, the gospel of Jesus, and the early Christian synthesis. His conclusion is that Paul was rather more successful in braiding together the Jewish and hellenistic strands than were either Philo and his fellow dispersionists or the other early Christian writers. This book (*Yale Studies in Religion,* No. 12) is a rewritten thesis. It is satisfactorily documented and learned; it is not especially easy reading. Those who, like him, have shovelled the heap of doctorial coal will not be unduly critical.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

New Gateways to Creative Living, by Hornell Hart, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941, pp. 197, $1.75.

The thesis which the author presents here is that the universe in which men live is creative and dynamic, and that they may utilize these living forces to become creative and dynamic themselves. Earlier sections of the book are given to developing the facts and the nature of man's outer world and to setting alongside this the facts and nature of man's inner world. Thence are developed gateways by and through which creative forces may be utilized by men to live joyously, abundantly, creatively, victoriously.

It is a clever and thought-provoking volume, but cast in a popular mould. Its content is within the range of the thoughtful laity. The minister will catalogue the book under "religion and health"—and will commend it to his friends.

W. R. McNUTT

War and Diplomacy in Eastern Asia, by Claude A. Buss, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. xi, 570, $5.00.

This is not an ephemeral piece of popular reporting, a series of newspaper despatches thrown together to make a book, but a careful and scholarly history of the forces which have brought about the war in the Far East. Professor Buss now occupies the chair of international relations in the University of Southern California. He prepared for that position, not only in the University of Pennsylvania, but as a member of the Foreign Service of the American Government with appointments in Peking and Nanking, and as executive assistant to the high commissioner of the Philippines. The book is divided into two sections. The first part gives the

history of the interests and policies of Japan and China; the second part, the interests and policies of the European powers and the United States in eastern Asia. It is worth noting that Buss is interested in more than a chronicle, that he writes as an interpreter whose concern is just relationships between the nations. "The chaos which obtains in Eastern Asia . . . derives precisely from statesmen's neglect to cultivate affairs of the spirit while blindly pursuing the chimera of power, prestige, and profit. The only hope of peace, with mutual prosperity, lies in the wholesale abandonment of past misdeeds, and in the substitution of a sense of international obligation for false concepts of national honor" (p. vi). There is a tribute on p. 554 which is also worth quoting: "It is true that many sincere propagandists for the Gospel have enlivened Sunday evening services with rather weird or distorted tales of the 'heathen Chinee,' but the modern missionary is as qualified as most writers or journalists to speak about Oriental affairs."

GORDON POTEAT

Social Welfare in the Catholic Church, by Marguerite T. Boylan, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. xx, 366, $3.00.

The author of this volume is the executive secretary of Catholic Charities in the diocese of Brooklyn. In part one, she surveys the development of Catholic charities from the personal supervision of the bishops in early times to the organization of diocesan bureaus of social welfare in the twentieth century. In part two, the work of such a bureau is shown by a detailed description of the bureau in the diocese of Brooklyn. In part three, problems of personnel, training of workers, finance, research, relationship with governmental agencies, etc., are considered. An extensive bibliography on social work includes many books by non-Catholics.

GORDON POTEAT

Now We Must Choose, by Henry N. Wieman, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 245, $2.00.

Professor Wieman has a fire burning in his bones. He hears men being called to defend democracy who have lost all touch with the underlying convictions which are the sources of faith in democracy. He notes their indifference and uncertainty, their lack of morale: "Our loyalties scrabble and slip and do not grip on anything with firmness and certainty." He has lifted his bugle to his lips to call the people to hear the word of the prophet once again. A lot of minor prophets in the churches of our land should be carrying this burden of the Lord. It is good to have this major prophet give them guidance to the sources which must be recovered for our people.

GORDON POTEAT

The Technique of Christian Living, by Isaiah Jefferson Brame, Nampa (Idaho), author, 1941, pp. 57, $1.00.

This booklet is privately published by the author who is minister of the First Baptist Church, Nampa, Idaho. It is well done and wholly worthy of a larger sale than it may have. In the course of years in the pastoral ministry the writer has discovered how to deal helpfully with those borne down by a sense of sin and guilt, those who live under some severe handicap, those facing death, those caught in the toils of the problem of evil, those who need to find help in prayer, and those whom he would help find the great therapeutic values of religion. I am ordering a copy as a gift to a young minister, that he may be saved the necessity of

learning such wisdom by the wasteful route of trial and error; let many others do the same. W. R. McNUTT

The Liberated Bible, by Shepherd Knapp, New York, Revell, 1941, pp. 286, $2.50.

Dr. Knapp, long in the pastoral ministry—the reviewer can testify to a very high type ministry—has given us here a "topical Bible" of an unusual variety. His guiding principle is not theological; it is rather literary and religious. He gathers the material of the Old Testament into five books, under which he has a total of twenty-two chapters. These books are: Human Raw Material for Religion to Shape, The Happiness of Unquestioning Faith, An Old Testament Wonder Book, Groping in the Dark, and The Emergence of a Deeper Faith. Such a volume in the hands of the people would go far to create sound and healthful ideas about the Bible, and at the same time to enhance a genuine appreciation. W. R. McNUTT

The Family Lives Its Religion, by Regina Westcott Wieman, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. ix, 236, $2.00.

"A plain, helpful guide for parents, who want religion to be a positive factor in their family life"—so the book is characterized. It is in two parts: "Creating the Family" and "The Creative Family."

The author gets down to where the family lives day after day, struggling with every sort of problem, and helps the family to think its way through, face up to the issues, and finally come off with victory. It is an excellent and wise piece of work which should prove invaluable to parents who, with their children, seek to grow the creative, genuinely religious family. W. R. McNUTT

Current Religious Thought: A Digest, by Charles S. Macfarland. Revell, New York, 1941, pp. 185, $1.50.

We have long since learned to think of Dr. Macfarland as a revered Nestor of American Protestantism. Since retirement from active leadership of the Federal Council of Churches, he has busied himself even more than previously in surveying the religious literature of the day. And he has brought together the most important of these reviews in a series of volumes of which the present issue is the fourth.

Current Religious Thought examines forty-five titles of the preceding year. It begins with John A. Mackay's *A Preface to Christian Theology* which is hailed as introducing "a trend in Christian thinking at Princeton Seminary." It concludes appropriately with six books, brought together under the caption "Christianity and Crisis: God or Cæsar," which wrestle principally with the Christian's relation to war. The remaining volumes are grouped under suitable headings, but there is little or no attempts to indicate their relationships. In each case, the reviewer has limited himself to about one thousand words. And it is his intention that the book should be allowed to tell its own story although the reviewer's own interests and prejudices have colored the accounts more than he probably realizes.

Dr. Macfarland's work must be taken as no more and no less than it professes. It is an anthology of pithy book notes by one of the best informed and most widely experienced minds in the church. One could wish for fuller treatment of the more notable contributions, for more critical appraisal, most of all for a more adequate final chapter of summary and conclusions. But the author has fulfilled well his delimited purpose. He has given us a sound and useful bird's-eye view of the wealth of material available. He has chosen wisely. And he has brought to his task an unusually incisive and altogether delightful insight. HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

BOOKS RECEIVED

Are We Immortal? by Winifred Kirkland, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 43, $0.90.

A simple and beautiful attempt to explain why one woman is herself convinced she must answer, "Yes." Miss Kirkland is a graduate of Vassar and of Bryn Mawr.

The Return to Religion, by Henry C. Link, New York, Macmillan, 1941 (popular edition), pp. 181, $1.00.

An inexpensive reprint of a volume which made a deal of stir a few years ago. Reviewed in the CROZER QUARTERLY, July, 1936, p. 231.

The Comprehensive Concordance to the Holy Scriptures, by J. B. R. Walker, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. vi, 957, $2.00.

A new and popular priced edition of a concordance in wide use since 1894. It is indexed under one alphabet, and accents proper names.

Squaring Up, by Julius Fischbach, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1941, pp. 165, $1.25.

Fifty talks to juniors by the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Lansing, Michigan.

Tongues of Fire, compiled by Grace H. Turnbull, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1941, pp. xxvi, 422, $3.50.

A reprint or reissue of the edition issued by Macmillan in 1929, with an additional index of six pages. It is intended to be "A Bible composed of Sacred Scriptures of the non-Christian world." Reviewed in the CROZER QUARTERLY, April, 1929, p. 238.

In the Shadow of the Cross, by Frederick K. Stamm, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. xi, 141, $1.50.

Fifteen sermons intended as a "challenge to Christian readers to meet their problems armed with a purposeful gospel, secure in the shadow of Jesus' cross."

On Guard, by Joseph R. Sizoo, New York, Macmillan, 1941, unpaged, $1.00.

A book of wholesome and sane devotional readings, one for each day of the year.

Points for Emphasis, by Height C. Moore, Nashville, Broadman, 1941, pp. 192, $0.35.

A vest pocket commentary on the International Sunday School Lessons for 1942, published by the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The Psychology of Aristotle, by Clarence Shute, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. xiv, 148, $2.00.

A discussion of Aristotle's contribution to the age-old question, Why do we behave like human beings? Five chapters: The Generation of the Organism, The Growth of the Organism, The Initiation and Control of Behavior, The Critical Activities of the Organism, Metaphysical Analysis of the Living Being.

**The French Laic Laws, 1879-1889,* by Evelyn M. Acomb, New York, Columbia University Press, pp. 282, $3.50.

**The Story of American Catholicism,* by Theodore Maynard, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. xv, 694, $3.50.

**A Creed for Free Men,* by William Adams Brown, New York, Scribner, 1941, pp. xiv, 277, $2.50.

**Contemporary Religious Thought,* compiled by Thomas S. Kepler, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941, pp. 413, $3.50.

**Let's Talk It Over!* by Leonard B. Aries, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. ix, 85, $1.50.

**Man's Quest for Salvation,* by Charles S. Braden, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. xii, 274, $2.50.

**The Inner World,* by John Wright Buckham, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xxvii, 292, $3.50.

**Maker of Men,* by Sherwood Eddy, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. 141, $1.50.

**Meister Eckhard: A Modern Translation,* made by Raymond B. Blakney, New York, 1941, pp. xxviii, 333.

**Prefaces to Inquiry,* by William Richard Gondin, New York, King's Crown Press, 1941, pp. x, 220, $2.00.

**Francis of Assisi: Apostle of Poverty,* by Ray C. Petry, Durham, Duke University Press, 1941, pp. ix, 199, $3.00.

**What We Can Believe,* by Randolph C. Miller, New York, Scribner, 1941, pp. xiv, 240, $2.00.

**The Missionary Message of the Bible,* by Julian Price Love, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. ix, 203, $2.00.

Ecumenical Trends in Hymnody, edited by Howard Chandler Robbins, New York, Commission on Worship, 1941, pp. 79, $0.20.

One of the *Pamphlet Library on Worship:* a series of essays by ten recognized leaders in this field.

**Documents of the Primitive Church,* by Charles Cutler Torrey, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xviii, 309, $3.50.

**The Unquenchable Light,* by Kenneth Scott Latourette, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xx, 191, $2.00.

**Christmas Traditions,* by William M. Auld, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 179, $1.90.

I Shall Meet Tomorrow Bravely, by Sybil Leonard Armes, Nashville, Broadman, 1941, pp. 56, $1.00.

A little primer of poems, wholesome even if not particularly original nor of the first water.

**Victorian Prelude,* by Maurice J. Quinlan, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. 301, $3.00.

* To be reviewed.